United Nations A/67/88–E/2012/75

General Assembly
Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
17 May 2012

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixty-seventh session
Item 24 (a) of the preliminary list*
Groups of countries in special situations: follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries

Economic and Social Council
Substantive session of 2012
New York, 2-27 July 2012
Item 6 (b) of the provisional agenda**
Implementation of and follow-up to major international United Nations conferences and summits: review and coordination of the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2011-2020

Implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2011 to 2020

Report of the Secretary-General

Summary

The present report is submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 66/213 and Economic and Social Council resolution 2011/9, in which the Secretary-General was requested to submit a progress report on the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2011-2020 (Istanbul Programme of Action). It includes a section on graduation and smooth transition as requested by the Assembly in its resolution 65/171.

* A/67/50.
** E/2012/100.

12-34474 (E) 050712

Please recycle

1. This first report assesses initial progress in the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action and challenges ahead. It analyses progress achieved in the past decade in the eight priority areas for action, thus providing a benchmark against which future progress will be measured. It also covers activities by all relevant stakeholders/vehicles including least developed countries and their development partners, South-South cooperation, parliaments, civil society, the private sector and the United Nations system. A section on graduation and smooth transition summarizes recent developments in this area. The report concludes with policy recommendations.

I. Recent trends in the goals and targets of the priority areas for action of the Istanbul Programme of Action

2. The Istanbul Programme of Action was adopted in May 2011. Because of the time lag in data generation, the assessment of progress in attaining the goals and targets — using statistical inference — will be included in subsequent reports only. However, since this is the first in a series of reports on the implementation of the Programme, this section analyses progress achieved in the past decade[1] and the current situation in the eight priority areas for action.[2] The analysis therefore provides a baseline against which future progress will be gauged.[3]

3. The least developed country group as a whole saw its growth performance improve considerably in the past decade. On average, gross domestic product (GDP) expanded annually by 6.6 per cent between 2001 and 2010, compared to the less than 4 per cent recorded during the period 1991-2000. This growth acceleration was underpinned by higher production and prices of primary commodities, increased investment in infrastructure development, good macroeconomic management, an improved political situation in many least developed countries, rising foreign direct investment (FDI) and remittance flows, and increased donor support in the form of aid and debt relief. However, the average for the decade stood below the 7 per cent target set in the Brussels Programme of Action and reiterated in the Istanbul Programme of Action.

4. The rate of economic growth varied among least developed countries and across time. Of the 47 countries for which data are available, 11 saw their GDP increase by more than 7 per cent per annum. The pace at which GDP grew also varied across the decade. The strongest growth rates were recorded between 2004 and 2008. GDP growth for the least developed country group as a whole reached its lowest level, at 4.5 per cent in 2009, when the global economy slid into recession.

5. Although recovery has been under way since 2010, it has been halting. In the wake of the recent sovereign crisis in Europe and growing financial sector fragility,

[1] The analysis differs from that of the 2011 report of the Secretary-General on the Ten-year appraisal and review of the implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010 (A/66/66-E/2011/78) at least on two counts. The analysis focuses on the goals and targets of the Istanbul Programme of Action, which are not the same as those of the Brussels Programme of Action, and covers 2010.

[2] The wording of the priority areas for action in the Istanbul Programme of Action is used as subheadings in this section.

[3] Statistical data for the goals and targets covered below are presented in annex I to the present *document*.

many advanced economies adopted fiscal austerity measures and experienced rising unemployment, contributing to a depression in domestic demand and GDP growth with spillover effects in least developed countries. In addition, there is the risk of declining official development assistance (ODA), with aid delivery also becoming more pro-cyclical and volatile. GDP growth in least developed countries is estimated to have decelerated to 4.9 per cent in 2011, down from the 5.5 per cent recorded in 2010.

6. The poverty headcount in least developed countries trended downward but remained high. The percentage of the population living on less than $1.25 a day stood at 53.4 per cent in 2005. In view of the above mixed developments, the challenge before many least developed countries is to secure growth that delivers decent jobs and enables these countries to make significant strides towards poverty reduction and broader social development.

Productive capacity

7. The strong economic growth posted by most least developed countries was not accompanied by increased value-addition in sectors with high employment-generation potential. On average, the share of agriculture dropped from 29 per cent of GDP in 2000 to 23 per cent in 2009/2010. This decline was more severe in African least developed countries (-8 per cent) than in Asian and Pacific least developed countries (-5 per cent). The share of services increased marginally, but mainly in the low-productivity informal sector. Similarly, the share of manufacturing remained virtually unchanged, accounting on average for 10 to 11 per cent of GDP. This development illustrates persistent challenges faced by most least developed countries in their quest to develop a vibrant manufacturing sector and to move up the value chain. By contrast, owing to stronger prices and output, natural resource-based sectors, such as mining and hydrocarbon industries, expanded significantly, especially in Africa.

8. The above trends suggest limited structural change towards high-productivity and labour-intensive sectors in most least developed countries. As a result, these countries were unable to generate a sufficient number of decent jobs for their growing working-age populations.

9. Progress with respect to infrastructure was also mixed. The strongest growth in information and communications technology across least developed countries was recorded in mobile communications, where subscriptions grew at staggering rates in the past decade. In 2001, only three least developed countries had a subscription rate of more than 3 per cent. By 2010, 33 least developed countries, or almost 70 per cent, posted a rate of more than 30 per cent. The liberalization of markets in least developed countries and increased competition among mobile operators along with the provision of services tailored to the needs and purchasing power of low-income households contributed to the rapid expansion of mobile communications.

10. By contrast, access to the Internet, although increasing steadily, remained low in the majority of least developed countries, with only 4 out of 100 people being Internet users in 2010. This average masks important disparities among least developed countries. The ratio of Internet users per 100 people in 2010 ranged from 0.21 in Timor-Leste to 25 in Tuvalu. Limited availability and high prices restricted access to the Internet together with limited use of computers, limited and unreliable supply of energy, scant access to the broadband radio spectrum and poor backbone

network infrastructure. Significant strides towards reaching the target of 100 per cent access to the Internet by 2020 cannot be achieved unless these obstacles are removed.

11. Although electricity generation in least developed countries increased in the past decade, the level of power supply was still far below the growing needs of this group of countries. Per capita electricity production in least developed countries rose from 132.49 kWh in 2001 to 193.15 kWh in 2009,[4] just 8 per cent of the level of per capita power generation of other developing countries.

12. The majority of least developed countries are endowed with vast sources of renewable energy — hydropower, thermal and solar resources — which they could tap into. Besides harnessing their power generation potential, better use of existing resources, including through improving the quality of power lines, better regulation, and pooling power into regional grids, could also contribute to increasing access to energy.

13. The Istanbul Programme of Action sets a target of substantively increasing combined rail and paved road mileage and sea and air networks by 2020. Limited available data suggest that progress in expanding these modes of transport is rather mixed. On average, total road mileage increased at a varying pace, with increases by more than 40 per cent in Ethiopia, Guinea, Mauritania and Togo. The quality of the roads, as mirrored by the relative size of the paved road network, did not keep up with the expansion of the road network, despite institutional reforms implemented by many least developed countries, including the establishment of second-generation road facilities funded through fuel levies, autonomous road agencies and maintenance management agencies.

14. Data on the state of railway systems are scant but generally indicate that little improvement occurred in the past decade. Passenger and freight traffic declined or at best stagnated in the majority of least developed countries for which data are available.

15. Air traffic increased in the majority of least developed countries, particularly in Asia and the Pacific, where steady growth was partially driven by tourism. The demise of national and regional airlines affected regional and international connectivity in many West African and Central African least developed countries, therefore reducing air traffic. Overall, air transport markets in the majority of least developed countries continued to be confronted with limited competition — which kept prices high — as well as safety issues.

16. Maritime transport in many least developed countries featured high tariffs caused by shallow shipping markets and long handling and processing times, which dampened traffic. Limited transportation links between ports and the hinterland further increased the shipping costs of landlocked least developed countries.

17. Least developed countries did not fare well compared to other developing countries both in terms of resources allocated to science, technology and innovation and the magnitude of knowledge production. As a result, least developed countries generated very little knowledge and very few modern technologies. Another challenge was aligning research with the specific needs of least developed countries. In addition, these countries were not able to exploit the existing flexibilities in

[4] The latest year for which data are available.

intellectual property right regimes and the World Trade Organization (WTO) Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement) in order to gain access to essential technologies that are used to produce essential goods and services for their populations.

Agriculture, food security and rural development

18. The majority of least developed countries did not witness a significant transformation of their agriculture sector in the past decade owing to scant funding for agricultural research and technology, little use of yield-enhancing practices and technologies, poor infrastructure, environmental degradation, unfavourable policy and regulatory frameworks — both domestically and internationally — along with emerging challenges such as climate change.

19. Surprisingly, food security in least developed countries seems to have improved. The prevalence of malnutrition among children under age 5 dropped in most of them. The multiplication of institutional innovations such as social safety nets contributed in part to improved food availability, access and adequacy in some least developed countries.

Trade

20. The share of least developed country exports in global exports more than doubled over the course of the past decade. Yet, much of this increase was driven by oil exports from Angola, Equatorial Guinea and the Sudan, exports of metals from the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Zambia, and, to a lesser extent, garment exports from Bangladesh. Elsewhere across the least developed countries, exports stagnated or declined marginally. In all, least developed country exports remained heavily dependent on natural resources and low-skilled manufactured goods.

21. Continued preferential market access was granted to least developed countries in the past decade. There were, however, some variations in the coverage of these preferential regimes, with the most generous schemes providing 100 per cent duty-free quota-free access combined with limited constraints regarding rules of origin.[5] Many emerging countries joined developed countries in according greater market access to least developed country products.

22. However, these preferences were not as effective as expected owing to preference erosion, non-tariff barriers and restrictive rules of origin, which limited the scope for regional and transregional cumulation between least developed countries and their trading partners. Furthermore, least developed countries continued to be confronted with severe supply constraints and trade-related infrastructure deficits.

23. Samoa finalized its WTO accession in May 2012. Vanuatu will become a member of WTO 30 days after notifying the secretariat of the domestic ratification of its accession package.

24. Three decisions pertaining to least developed countries were taken at the eighth session of the WTO Ministerial Conference, held in Geneva in December

[5] The new European Union rules of origin for the Generalized System of Preferences, which became effective in 2011, have been simplified and relaxed, with more generous rules for least developed countries.

2011. The first directs WTO members to streamline and operationalize, by July 2012, the 2002 least developed country Accession Guidelines (document WT/L/846). The second decision encourages the provision of special concessions in the area of trade in services to least developed countries and for least developed country service suppliers. The third decision calls on the TRIPS Council to give full consideration to a duly motivated request from least developed countries for an extension of their transition period before the present deadline ends in mid-2013.

Commodities

25. The production base of the majority of least developed countries was dominated by natural resource-based sectors. The share of these sectors even increased, owing to the recent commodity boom. On average, the share of primary commodity exports in total exports grew from 55 per cent in 2001 to 67 per cent in 2009/10. Countries as Bhutan, the Gambia, Samoa, the Sudan and Togo managed to increase their exports of services and/or manufacturing goods.

26. Commodity prices fluctuated significantly in the past decade. In 2007/2008, commodity prices doubled. Sharp declines then followed as the global economy tipped into recession and overall price volatility increased. Because of the structure of their economies and limited shock-smoothing instruments at their disposal, least developed countries were the most affected by this volatility.

Human and social development

27. Improvements in education outcomes, which started in the 1990s, were nurtured and expanded during the 2000s. Primary enrolment in least developed countries improved significantly. International initiatives, namely the Millennium Development Goals and Education for All, strong political commitment and significant policy changes, including the abolition of school fees, largely contributed to this. Concomitantly, the increasing numbers of children completing primary school caused gross enrolment in secondary education to rise significantly, from 25 per cent in 2001 to 39 per cent in 2010/11. A similar trend took hold in tertiary education.

28. Despite this progress, there are concerns about the quality of education and training at all levels as evidenced, for instance, by high repetition rates. A related issue is skill mismatch, with the knowledge acquired by secondary, technical and vocational, and tertiary education graduates not always being in line with labour market demand. Also, overall progress in education and training hides important disparities across geographic location, gender and social and economic status.

29. In the past decade, infant and child mortality rates fell in nearly all least developed countries, although at varying speed. Cambodia, Rwanda and Timor-Leste witnessed the largest reductions, with both their infant and child mortality rates declining by 40 per cent or more. Despite this progress, mortality rates continued to be abnormally high in most least developed countries.

30. Maternal mortality rates were also on the decline but still standing at very high levels in most least developed countries, with 1,000 maternal deaths or more per 100,000 live births in four of them. Least developed countries were among the countries with the highest unmet need for contraceptives and family planning in the world.

31. Despite the continued reduction in new HIV infections, many least developed countries still had the highest rates in the world. The percentage of population aged 15 to 49 living with HIV in the most affected least developed countries ranged from 14 to 24 per cent. Improved access to antiretroviral treatment for HIV/AIDS reduced the number of AIDS-related deaths. The burden of malaria and tuberculosis, albeit still heavy, also eased in most least developed countries owing to bold global and domestic initiatives.

32. Strong demographic growth led to a large and growing youth population in least developed countries; almost 60 per cent of the population is under the age of 25. Improvements in secondary, technical and vocational and tertiary education were not as outstanding as those in primary education. Thus, high unemployment rates among the educated occurred in a context of significant skill shortages.

33. Growing populations in least developed countries created a strong demand for housing, particularly in cities where demographic expansion was the strongest. The convergence of, inter alia, rapid urbanization, inadequate land administration systems and insufficient investment in basic infrastructure, led to the proliferation of slums. Through effective urban planning and building regulations, a number of least developed countries were able to reduce the slum phenomenon.

34. Access to improved water sources and sanitation facilities expanded in an overwhelming majority of least developed countries. However, only 61 per cent of the population was served with improved water sources in 2008 compared to 55 per cent eight years earlier. The deficit in sanitation was even more severe, with only 36 per cent of the population using an improved sanitation facility in 2008. This was still a slight improvement over the 30 per cent level of access in 2000. Differences in access to improved water sources and sanitation between rural and urban areas continued to be significant. Insufficient investment in the sector, poor operation and maintenance and inadequate management practices, among other things, contributed to the slow progress recorded over the last decade.

35. Progress in gender equality and the empowerment of women was strong. Gender disparity in education consistently decreased across least developed countries, with 10 of them reaching parity in primary education. Although significant gains were recorded in tertiary education, women students remained at a distinct disadvantage in most least developed countries. On average, in 2010/11 56 women were enrolled in tertiary education for every 100 men.

36. Concerning economic participation, and particularly job opportunities, scarce available data indicate that employment rates for women increased. However, women still accounted for the majority of employment in agriculture and the informal sector, where productivity and wages are low.

37. Political participation was the area where gains appeared to have been the greatest. The percentage of parliamentary seats held by women, for instance, more than doubled, jumping from 10 per cent in 2001 to almost 23 per cent in 2010. Affirmative action policies, such as electoral quotas and reserved seats, and gender-sensitive electoral systems contributed to improving the level of women's political participation in many countries.

38. To respond to emergency situations and crises that occurred during the decade, a large number of least developed countries designed or expanded safety net programmes, specifically targeting poor and vulnerable groups. Social protection

programmes helped to protect some poor and marginalized groups from hunger and malnutrition and to sustain their access to basic education and health in times of crisis. Yet, most of these programmes are still in the initial stages, covering only a small share of the population of least developed countries, and face financial sustainability and administrative problems.

Multiple crises and other emerging challenges

39. Favourable external conditions, including rising commodity prices and increasing financial flows, combined with prudent macroeconomic policies, enabled least developed countries to build significant buffers in the form of, for instance, foreign reserve accumulation and lower domestic debt. On average, total reserves as a percentage of external debt swelled from 15.7 per cent in 2001 to 57.7 per cent in 2010. In the meantime, the share of debt service as a percentage of external debt declined markedly from 11.9 per cent in 2001 to 4.4 per cent in 2010. These macroeconomic policy buffers provided many least developed countries with some space to withstand relatively well the various crises that erupted during the last part of the decade, which nevertheless affected least developed countries seriously.

40. The record of least developed countries with respect to environmental sustainability is mixed. The proportion of land area covered by forest declined from 31 per cent in 2000 to 29.6 per cent in 2010. However, the proportion of protected terrestrial and marine areas increased from 9.5 per cent in 2000 to 9.8 per cent in 2010. This could contribute to protect biodiversity in least developed countries. In addition, carbon dioxide emissions per capita remained constant at 0.2 per cent, which was around 7 per cent of the average for all developing countries.

Challenges and progress in least developed countries with respect to adaptation to climate change

Recent international negotiations, including the 17th Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, held in Durban, South Africa in December 2011, have led to very limited success with respect to climate change mitigation, making the challenges of adapting to the effects of climate change even more urgent, especially for least developed countries.

Their lack of economic diversification and reliance on climate-sensitive commodities for export, such as agricultural products, expose least developed countries to the double threat of economic and environmental shocks. It is estimated that for every 1 degree Celsius rise in average global temperatures, average annual growth in least developed countries could drop by 2 to 3 percentage points.[a] Land degradation and desertification in least developed countries could also carry a high human cost as people are uprooted from their traditional lands. African least developed countries in particular face the risk of losing large portions of their arable land, with not only dire consequences in terms of poverty and hunger but also political instability and social breakdown. Water shortage is also threatening sustainable livelihoods, especially of the rural poor. Furthermore, the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events in least developed countries has increased fivefold in the past three decades and the number of people affected by these weather events has almost

doubled. Least developed countries therefore have one of the largest burdens of climate-sensitive diseases.

Consequently, it is of vital importance to least developed countries to intensify their adaptation efforts, with support from the United Nations system through a variety of measures, including scaling up investment for sustainable agricultural intensification; adopting climate-smart approaches to rural development; greater attention to risk and resilience in order to manage environment- and natural resource-related shocks; engagement in value chains to drive green growth; improved governance of natural assets for poor rural people by strengthening land tenure and community-led empowerment; equality and empowerment for women and indigenous peoples in managing natural resources; and increased access by poor rural communities to environment and climate finance.

In a March 2012 communication, the High-level Task Force on Global Food Security emphasized that the adoption of climate-smart agriculture and strategies to help small-scale producers, who are often women, to connect to markets can increase their resilience to climate shocks. Reducing losses and waste in food production is also a relevant strategy in that respect.

One of the main tools available to least developed countries with respect to adaptation to climate change is the national adaptation programmes of action, which most least developed countries have prepared and started to implement. This process has increased knowledge and awareness of climate change, developed best practices and taught valuable lessons. The simplified project cycle for Least Developed Country Fund projects has made it easier for these countries to access funds under the Global Environment Facility. As at December 2011, the Fund had approved some $217 million for projects and mobilized more than $919 million in co-financing. However, more funds are needed to scale up the programme and implement all national adaptation programmes of action; at the end of 2011, only $537 million had been pledged for all of the 48 least developed countries.

At the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change in Durban, a decision was taken to launch the Green Climate Fund and to make provisions for allocating a minimum amount of resources for countries particularly vulnerable to climate change, such as least developed countries (decision 3/CP.17). It was also decided to balance the allocation of the Green Climate Fund resources between adaptation and mitigation activities, and to have dedicated seats for least developed countries and small island developing States on the governing board. However, the precise volume of finance to be channelled through the Fund remains unclear.

In conclusion, the mainstreaming of adaptation measures into relevant national policies is of great importance for least developed countries. Various sources of international funding and risk tools could be accessed to help to finance capital and capacity-building costs for adaptation to climate change in least developed countries. These include existing climate-related schemes such as those established by the World Bank and other development banks.

[a] See United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), The Least Developed Countries Report 2010: Towards a New International Development Architecture for LDCs (UNCTAD/LDC/2010).

41. In the past decade, disaster reduction gained growing recognition among policymakers in many least developed countries. Several started to build or strengthen disaster management capacities and to implement the Hyogo Framework for Action, with the aim of building or improving early warning, preparedness and response systems. Given the cross-border nature of some hazards and in order to build synergies among national disaster management strategies, regional organizations also played an important role in these efforts.

Mobilizing financial resources for development and capacity-building

42. Domestic saving rates increased in least developed countries, rising from 11.6 per cent in 2000 to 15.9 per cent in 2009/10, driven largely by the performance of African least developed countries. Despite this increase, savings rates were largely below levels reached by other developing countries, therefore limiting the ability of least developed countries to invest and grow.

43. Domestic tax revenues and public savings increased in many countries, driven in part by improved tax administration. On the spending side, public expenditure management reforms helped many least developed countries to make progress in budget preparation, execution, and monitoring. The challenge ahead is to consolidate and expand these gains.

44. Net ODA disbursements to least developed countries increased significantly in the past decade to $44 billion in 2010. This represents 0.11 per cent of the gross national income of Development Assistance Committee members, up from 0.05 per cent in 1999/00. Also, the share of total aid channelled to least developed countries rose by 10 percentage points in the same period, suggesting that priority is increasingly being given to least developed countries in aid allocation. Despite these achievements, the level of the ODA-to-gross domestic income ratio fell short of the target of 0.15-0.2 per cent reaffirmed in the Istanbul Programme of Action. However, net bilateral ODA flows to least developed countries are estimated to have recently dropped by 8.9 per cent in real terms to $27.7 billion in 2011, whereas overall ODA declined by only 3 per cent. The aid landscape in least developed countries also changed, with a number of emerging countries, such as Brazil, China, South Africa and Turkey, and private foundations and philanthropists becoming important aid providers.

45. While some aspects of aid effectiveness, particularly the strengthening of public financial management systems, saw some improvements, progress in others,

particularly the use of recipient-country systems and the reduction of transaction costs associated with the provision of aid, was slow. There were important strides towards formally untying aid, although de facto tying of aid persisted.

46. As a result of a series of debt relief initiatives, including the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative and the Multilateral Debt Relief Initiative, the debt burden of many least developed countries, particularly those that had reached the completion point of these initiatives, lessened. However, the global crisis that erupted during the end of the decade increased markedly the debt vulnerabilities of many least developed countries, with many of them in a situation of debt stress or at high risk of debt stress. Further, not all least developed countries were eligible for these international debt relief initiatives. As at January 2012, 25 of the 32 countries that had reached the completion point of the HIPC Initiative were least developed countries.

47. During the past decade, FDI in least developed countries increased at a much faster pace than the GDP and trade of this group of countries, helped largely by rising commodity prices, ongoing privatization processes, improved growth prospects, greater openness to FDI and greater integration in international production networks. Despite this increase, least developed countries accounted for a marginal share of total FDI flows to developing countries and, more worrisome, FDI to least developed countries declined in 2009 and 2010. After reaching $17 billion in 2008 — up from $6.6 billion in 2001 — net FDI inflows to least developed countries declined to $14 billion in 2010.

48. Remittances to least developed countries also increased significantly, soaring from $6.8 billion in 2001 to $24.8 billion in 2010. The size of remittances was particularly important in Asian least developed countries, where they largely outpaced other traditional sources of financing, such as ODA. However, a major challenge associated with remittances is brain drain, particularly in African least developed countries.

Good governance at all levels

49. Political governance improved in least developed countries, although progress was uneven. Several democratic elections were conducted in the past decade, and checks and balances on the executive branch of government increasingly took hold.

50. Commitment to the fight against corruption was also strong, as half of the least developed countries signed and ratified the United Nations Convention against Corruption and nine others accepted it. Between April 2010 and April 2012, the number of least developed countries complying with the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative increased from one to six, namely the Central African Republic, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, the Niger and Timor-Leste. These countries make information on revenue data from extractive industries publicly available. Most least developed countries undertook public financial management reforms, particularly public procurement, payroll management and internal control systems. This resulted in better budget execution and reporting and, ultimately, better use of resources. Again, improvements varied considerably across least developed countries and progress was constrained in part by limited capacity, particularly in those emerging from conflict.

51. Progress was made in ensuring that least developed countries have greater voice in global governance. Owing to the quota and voice reforms, the voting shares of least developed countries in the Bretton Woods institutions increased. Yet, except for the International Development Agency (IDA), where least developed countries account for 11.56 per cent of the voting shares, least developed country voting shares remain low and are not commensurate with their demographic weight and their share in the total activities of international financial organizations.

II. Initial efforts to ensure the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action

Mainstreaming the Istanbul Programme of Action into national development and cooperation frameworks

52. The Istanbul Programme of Action places great emphasis on the Programme being mainstreamed into relevant planning documents by least developed countries, partner countries and the international community. Several least developed countries, particularly Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malawi and Mauritania, have started to align their development plans and frameworks with the priority areas of action of the Istanbul Programme of Action, to foster development and achieve graduation. The seventh National Socioeconomic Development Plan, 2011-15, of the Lao People's Democratic Republic, for instance, aims to secure at least 8 per cent GDP growth per annum, achieve the Millennium Development Goals by 2015, and take substantial steps towards graduation from least developed country status by 2020.

53. Strong political will at the highest level and broad participation have underpinned these mainstreaming efforts. The Prime Minister of Bangladesh, for instance, held a cabinet meeting dedicated to the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action, thus raising awareness among all line ministries. Further, the involvement of all stakeholders is foreseen in the implementation of the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy for 2011-2016. In Cambodia, the parliament, in collaboration with the Ministry of Planning, the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) and the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States organized a meeting with the aim of disseminating the Istanbul Programme of Action, creating a platform to identify mechanisms for information-sharing among the Parliament, the Government, international organizations and civil society organizations and agreeing on recommendations for its effective implementation.

54. Many more least developed countries are in the process of formulating new national development plans. This provides an opportunity to mainstream the Istanbul Programme of Action at the national level. An increased focus of national policies and plans on the priorities of the Programme of Action in line with national priorities could greatly enhance the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action as compared to the Brussels Programme of Action.

55. While hardly any reference to the Brussels Programme of Action could be found in donor strategies for the period 2001-2010, several development partners have started to mention least developed countries and the Istanbul Programme of Action in relevant documents. The recent European Union document entitled

"Council conclusions on the European Union's approach to trade, growth and development in the next decade"[6] calls for greater differentiation in the design and implementation of European Union trade, investment and development policies in order to further sharpen the focus on least developed countries. Specifically, the European Union envisages focusing Aid for Trade more on least developed countries and supporting and facilitating their accession to WTO. Similarly, Australia committed to prioritizing the particular needs of least developed countries as expressed in the Istanbul Programme of Action in its development cooperation strategy. Furthermore, many aid agencies of Development Assistance Committee donors refer to least developed countries in their documents. However, the focus of support towards these countries by most donors is sti'l limited.

56. South-South cooperation also has an important role in the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action and several developing countries have taken action in this respect. At the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries, Turkey announced a support package for least developed countries that includes financial and technical support, scholarships, the promotion of FDI and support for monitoring the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action. Brazil, China, India and others have committed to increasing their support to least developed countries and promoting an exchange of experiences.

57. Immediately after the above-mentioned Conference, the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States prepared a road map for the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action in collaboration with the United Nations system, other international organizations and Member States. The aim of the road map is to mobilize the active and constructive engagement of all the development partners of least developed countries by proposing specific roles for the various actors, including the United Nations system, in a targeted and time-bound manner.

58. An important element of the road map is the creation of task forces to establish, inter alia, a technology bank and a science, technology and innovation support mechanism dedicated to least developed countries. Several working groups, including those on indicators for measuring progress towards reaching the goals and targets, crisis mitigation and resilience-building, resource mobilization in support of the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action and agriculture and food security have also been established. Their aim is to propose practical ways and means to implement broad commitments contained in the Programme of Action. The working group on indicators has proposed, reviewed and finalized a set of indicators for the monitoring, follow-up and review of the Programme of Action. This set of indicators is expected to inform the national, regional and global monitoring, follow-up and review of the Istanbul Programme of Action.[7]

59. There has been impressive progress in mainstreaming the Istanbul Programme of Action into development policies and strategies of least developed countries and development cooperation frameworks of development partners, particularly in view of the short time that has elapsed since the adoption of the Programme of Action.

[6] 3154th Foreign Affairs (Trade) Council meeting, 16 March 2012.

[7] See further explanation in annex I to the present document.

The crucial step ahead is for all development partners to follow and implement concrete measures in the priority areas for action.

Engagement of different stakeholders in the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action

60. The recognition of the role and contribution of actors such as parliaments, the private sector, and civil society in the implementation, monitoring, follow-up and review of the Istanbul Programme of Action is one of its novelties.

61. The Istanbul Programme of Action clearly states that parliaments have an important role in debating development strategies and overseeing their implementation and in the effective monitoring and follow-up of the Programme of Action. IPU organized a briefing session on the Programme of Action in October 2011 that sought to raise awareness of the Programme in the parliamentary community, both in least and non-least developed countries, and highlight the important role of parliaments reflected in the Programme of Action. IPU launched guidelines on how to mainstream the Programme of Action into the work of national parliaments and the strengthening of the parliamentary focal point mechanism. Least developed country parliaments are encouraged to nominate focal points for the least developed country process and to share all relevant information with each other. Parliaments are also encouraged to adopt national parliamentary action plans.

62. In addition, a joint IPU-United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States project on "Promoting parliamentary contributions to the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action for the least developed countries" aims at strengthening the ability of least developed country parliaments to design, implement, monitor, assess and provide follow-up to the Istanbul Programme of Action. The project would reinforce the contribution of parliaments to development, promote the exchange of knowledge and best practices, foster discussions on current development topics among parliaments, promote research and training in development matters and ensure the presence of parliamentary voices in global decision-making.

63. Civil society country consultations were held in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malawi, Rwanda and the United Republic of Tanzania. A Pacific regional meeting of civil society organizations was organized in Auckland, New Zealand, in September 2011 to identify common aims and objectives of civil society groups in the Pacific in order to support collaboration. Civil society organization meetings are also planned for the African and Asian least developed countries, with the aim of disseminating the content of the Istanbul Programme of Action among civil society organizations from least developed countries and facilitating in-depth discussions on some of the priority areas of the Programme of Action. In addition, the participants intend to agree on regional strategies for the implementation of the Programme of Action.

64. Academia is increasingly involved in the implementation and monitoring of the Istanbul Programme of Action. A group of think tanks and academic institutions from least developed countries and partner countries established an independent monitoring mechanism for the implementation of the Programme of Action. The

new initiative, called "LDC IV Monitor",[8] is planning to undertake policy research, organize dialogues and conduct outreach activities. It will complement the official follow-up and review mechanism of the Istanbul Programme of Action.

65. As regards the private sector contribution, several initiatives were started at the Istanbul Conference. The Private Sector Steering Committee[9] provided a series of recommendations to Governments to support entrepreneurship and private enterprise, promote domestic markets, invest in infrastructure, connectivity and workforce development, encourage foreign investment, increase international trade and engage in partnerships. It was agreed to explore developing a mentoring system for least developed country stock exchanges with developed and emerging market exchanges.

66. The Global Compact has stepped up the establishment of local networks in least developed countries, with 10 new networks established in 2011/12. These networks are helping to advance sustainable business development; creating special forums for enterprises and other stakeholders to dialogue on challenging issues and advance joint solutions; and connecting least developed countries to the broader global economy and related supply chains. The Private Sector Steering Committee has agreed to establish a well-structured platform, which will facilitate collaboration and interaction among least developed country and non-least developed country private sectors regarding the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action.

67. Parliaments, civil society and the private sector not only actively participated in the Istanbul Conference but have also started contributing to the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action in their respective areas. They also need to be more involved in intergovernmental processes.

Support by the United Nations system, regional and international organizations for least developed country priorities

68. The Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States has been tasked with the full mobilization and coordination of the United Nations system for the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action. Since May 2011, it has organized several inter-agency consultative meetings in this respect.

69. A number of United Nations entities have already taken decisions to mainstream the Istanbul Programme of Action and integrate its provisions into their work programmes, including the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the United Nations Capital Development Fund, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the

[8] See http://www.ldc4monitor.org.

[9] The Private Sector Steering Committee was established prior to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries. It comprises private sector representatives from least developed countries and their development partners and aims to elevate private sector investment in least developed countries and mobilize business engagement towards development objectives.

United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS), the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women), the World Food Programme (WFP), the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO). In several others, the issue will be on the agenda of the next meeting of their governing bodies. Many agencies are also allocating 50 per cent or more of their budget to least developed countries (see annex II to the present document). Several United Nations entities organized meetings to support least developed countries in the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action, mostly in collaboration with the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (see annex III). Concomitantly, such United Nations coordination mechanisms as the High-level Committee on Programmes and the Chief Executives Board for Coordination (CEB), have taken up the issue of the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action.

70. IPU was also requested by its members to mobilize support for the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action. The WTO membership is expected to institutionally mainstream the trade-related elements of the Programme of Action into its work by revising the work programme of its subcommittee on least developed countries.

71. Policy-oriented research and analysis on development issues of interest to least developed countries constitute an important component of the work of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the Secretariat, the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA), the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), ESCAP, the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), UNCTAD and the World Bank. Their publications, such as UNCTAD's LDC reports, have contributed to generating a body of knowledge on a wide range of issues relevant to least developed countries, informing global and regional consensus-building and providing an informed basis both for capacity-building and advisory services and financial assistance in support of least developed country development. The least developed country information portal of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs pertains to international support and smooth transition measures and provides relevant information to least developed countries in this respect.[10]

72. Operational activities undertaken by the United Nations and other organizations cover all the eight priority areas of the Istanbul Programme of Action. This summary highlights some of the efforts of the United Nations and other regional and international organizations in support of least developed country development.

73. The consensus on the centrality of productive capacity-building for sustainable development is reflected in the theme of the 2012 Economic and Social Council annual ministerial review, which will provide a platform to share experiences in implementing policies geared towards building and enhancing productive capacity in order to achieve internationally agreed employment-related development goals.

[10] See www. un.org/ldcportal.

74. The World Bank and such regional banks as the Asian and African Development Banks, have supported the infrastructure sectors of least developed countries, covering energy, transport, irrigation, water and sanitation, and information and communications technology. This assistance has targeted both the physical infrastructure and regulation and national policies.

75. ITU has developed modalities to support least developed countries in reducing their digital gap, creating and maintaining an enabling telecommunication/ information and communications technology policy and regulatory environment and building the required human and institutional capacity. IAEA has activities relating to coordinating and supporting energy planning.

76. Science, technology and innovation has also received growing attention in the programmatic work of a number of United Nations agencies. UNESCO has assisted 24 least developed countries in designing and implementing their national science, technology and innovation policies and in building the related capacities. Similarly, WIPO has supported several least developed countries in the area of innovation and creativity, especially to strengthen intellectual property and innovation policies and strategies and to improve access to knowledge.

77. Supporting a greater engagement between subnational governments and the private sector is an important part of the work of the United Nations Capital Development Fund on productive capacity-building in least developed countries. The Fund's local economic development initiatives are designed to leverage the ability of local governments to engage with the private sector in attracting needed investments and generating employment.

78. In the services sector, eight agencies instituted the United Nations Steering Committee on Tourism for Development in order to unlock the full potential of tourism in least developed countries by helping them to articulate their specific tourism-related needs and identifying the agency capabilities that could be used to address those needs. With respect to the mining sector, IAEA is providing technical cooperation services to some least developed countries. This assistance is aimed at improving safety and security standards of uranium mining.

79. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) has engaged in a wide range of activities in least developed countries covering agriculture, food and nutrition, fisheries, forestry and sustainable development. These activities are designed to secure increased and more effective public and private investment in agriculture and rural development, sustainable management and use of natural resources, and improved food security and better nutrition. Similarly, some of the interventions of the United Nations Capital Development Fund lend technical support and advice to local leaders on ways and means to integrate food security strategies into the investment planning of subnational governments. The improvement of agricultural productivity and food security is also pursued through the UN-Women programme "Securing the rights and livelihoods of rural women in the context of the food crisis and climate change".

80. One example of a global initiative aimed at responding to the food crisis is the Comprehensive Framework for Action, which brought together a large number of organizations, including FAO, the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the World Bank. The Comprehensive Framework for Action recommended specific measures aimed at, among other things, relieving the

immediate plight of vulnerable consumers and boosting small farmer food production. Many least developed countries have benefited from the Global Food Crisis Response Programme, which is an implementing instrument of the Comprehensive Framework for Action.

81. In the area of trade, WTO continues to support least developed countries, in particular through biennial technical assistance plans, the Enhanced Integrated Framework and the Standards and Trade Development Facility. The Enhanced Integrated Framework supported the efforts of least developed countries to integrate trade issues into their national development strategies, establish structures for a coordinated delivery of trade-related assistance and build capacity to trade, including the removal of supply-side bottlenecks. Thirty least developed countries have benefited from this programme, with some tangible results in the areas of trade mainstreaming and the coordination of Aid for Trade.

82. Some agencies, such as the International Trade Centre (ITC), have provided least developed countries with trade-related information through web portals. This information not only improves the transparency of global trade and market access but also helps least developed country exporters to make informed decisions. A similar initiative has been promoted by the World Bank and the Department of Economic and Social Affairs in the context of aid for trade research partnerships.

83. Least developed countries have also benefited from the Standards and Trade Development Facility, which is managed and run by WTO. The purpose of this facility is to enable countries to meet international sanitary and phytosanitary standards, guidelines and recommendations, therefore securing access to international markets.

84. The Common Fund for Commodities has initiated and implemented projects across least developed countries, with a view to supporting them in developing commodity value chains. These projects encompass all dimensions of commodity-related opportunities and vulnerabilities, including production and productivity, horizontal and vertical diversification, value addition, price risk management, experience-sharing and capacity-building.

85. Interventions undertaken by the United Nations and other international organizations have covered practically all dimensions of human and social development. In the context of promoting quality education for all in least developed countries, UNESCO has paid particular attention to 20 such countries where education outcomes are the lowest, focusing on literacy, teachers, skills for the world of work, and education sector-wide policy and planning.

86. With respect to population and health, UNFPA has supported least developed countries in population situation analysis, assessment of the nexus between population dynamics and development challenges, the development and implementation of censuses and the analysis of census data. Similarly, UNICEF has joined hands with other United Nations agencies in generating a body of knowledge on child-centred Millennium Development Goals, which has spurred action in support of maternal and child health. Furthermore, the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) supports least developed countries in formulating and implementing effective and comprehensive responses to the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

87. As far as youth is concerned, the United Nations Capital Development Fund, with seed capital provided by the MasterCard Foundation, has launched "Youth Start", a programme designed to enable 10 financial service providers in seven African least developed countries to develop and deliver relevant financial services to younger clients. Regarding shelter, the United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat) has supported a number of least developed countries in addressing their needs in terms of urban planning and development, land and housing through a number of interventions.

88. As regards gender equality and the empowerment of women, the protection of women's and children's rights features prominently in the activities of UNICEF, UNFPA and UN-Women, including assistance in mainstreaming gender into their national development plans and policies. Similarly, gender responsiveness in strategic planning, including at the local level, and economic empowerment has also received attention. The United Nations Capital Development Fund and UN-Women are in the process of formulating the Access for Women's Empowerment Facility, with a view to enabling more women to access appropriate and effective financial and non-financial services.

89. Several organizations are supporting least developed countries in the area of multiple crises and other emerging challenges. To help low-income countries, many of which are least developed countries, to withstand the effects of economic shocks, IMF established, under the umbrella of the Poverty Reduction and Growth Trust, three new concessional lending instruments, namely the Extended Credit Facility, the Standby Credit Facility and the Rapid Credit Facility, which range from short-term and emergency financing to medium-term balance of payment support.

90. The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) has concentrated its support on enhancing the capacity of least developed countries to incorporate climate change responses into national development processes. Its activities are aimed at assisting least developed countries in adapting to climate change, mitigating its effects, reducing emissions from deforestation and expanding knowledge and communication on climate change. UNESCO is contributing to global responses to climate change by, inter alia, expanding the knowledge base on climate change, promoting public awareness and offering policy and planning advice.

91. The Strategic Initiative to Address Climate Change in the least developed countries is one of the major instruments of UNDP to support such countries in addressing their climate change challenges. Areas covered by this instrument include capacity-building for the international climate negotiations, access to climate finance, and the mainstreaming of climate change into national development processes.

92. Within the context of the Climate Investment Funds, the World Bank and other international and regional organizations established the pilot programme for climate resilience to support least developed countries in factoring resilience and adaptation into their national development plans and strategies.

93. Climate change-related assistance to least developed countries also pertains to finance. The United Nations Capital Development Fund has developed the Local Adaptive Living Facility, with the aim of channelling to municipal governments

additional funds needed for climate-change and natural-disaster mitigating interventions.

94. A new activity in which the United Nations Capital Development Fund is partnering with UNDP is CleanStart, which is meant to deliver financing and technical assistance to microfinance institutions with the aim of enabling them to facilitate the adoption and use of clean energy technologies by the poor.

95. WMO has supplied some least developed countries with weather-observing systems and climate data management systems, thus helping them to generate essential weather and water-related information and services, which are central to better management of climate change and weather risks. Along with the provision of equipment, WMO has also offered these countries advocacy and capacity-building services.

96. The parties to the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification have teamed up with a number of United Nations specialized agencies and regional commissions, particularly with a view to supporting the efforts of some least developed countries to combat desertification, land degradation and drought. As part of its technical cooperation programme, IAEA has supported least developed countries in acquiring a better understanding and quantifiable estimates of the groundwater and surface water sources. This knowledge contributes to better planning and efficient management of these resources.

97. UNEP provides assistance for the management of harmful substances and hazardous waste to enable least developed countries to institute appropriate policy and control systems and to meet international obligations pertaining to harmful substances and hazardous waste.

98. UN-Habitat has been involved in a number of activities that contribute to disaster reduction including, for example, support for local mitigation interventions for decreasing vulnerabilities to cyclones and earthquakes in Mozambique.

99. Another example of initiatives aimed at alleviating the impact of natural disasters is the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery, which was established by the World Bank in partnership with 39 countries and eight international organizations. The Facility has extended grant financing and a slew of analytical and advisory services to help low-income countries, most of which are least developed countries, to reduce their vulnerability to natural hazards and adapt to climate change. UNEP has been active in helping least developed countries tackle vulnerability to conflicts and natural hazards. This support includes both prevention and response to these crisis situations.

100. As regards the mobilization of financial resources, the United Nations Capital Development Fund has established the Local Finance Initiative, which is geared towards mobilizing domestic capital and directing it to viable small-scale, traditional and industrial infrastructure projects. With the financial support of the Gates Foundation and the MasterCard Foundation, the Fund has contributed to building the capacity of financial services providers in least developed countries to offer saving services.

101. As far as ODA is concerned, the Development Cooperation Forum of the Economic and Social Council conducts discussions on a strengthened mutual accountability framework between the least developed countries and their

development partners. The Forum also covers the issues of aid quantity and quality and contributes to an improved global assessment of progress in the implementation of least developed country-related aid commitments.

102. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and several United Nations entities are involved in the follow-up to the Fourth High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, including OECD work on indicators relating to the commitments made at the Forum, which was held in Busan, Republic of Korea, at the end of 2011. However, it is worth noting that the new Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation did not specifically mention least developed countries. OECD also plans to continue monitoring the commitments agreed upon at the High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness in Paris and at the Third High-level Forum, in Accra, which have major implications for least developed country development.

103. An essential part of UNDP's assistance to least developed countries in the area of governance relates to enhancing the democratic process, strengthening institutions, including parliaments and judiciary systems, and promoting the rule of law. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States and other United Nations organizations are developing educational materials that highlight, in the context of least developed countries, the nexus between human rights, particularly the right to development, and such issues as trade and FDI. UN-Women assisted many least developed countries in scaling up women's participation and representation in the decision-making process, including by advocating in favour of a quota system in parliaments.

104. In the areas of macroeconomic management, public financial management systems, the fight against corruption and recovery of stolen assets, and post-conflict management, specific programmes dedicated to least developed countries have been implemented. Through its technical assistance, IMF has supported many least developed countries in building their capacities in such areas as macroeconomic policy, tax policy and revenue administration, expenditure management, exchange rate systems, and macroeconomic and financial statistics. The United Nations Capital Development Fund has initiated programmes to address the procurement and financial administration challenges facing local governments.

105. Regarding the fight against corruption, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has contributed to advancing the United Nations Convention against Corruption in least developed countries through, inter alia, the assessment of national anti-corruption legislation and practices with a view to identifying shortcomings, and the reform and drafting of anti-corruption legislation. Many least developed countries have benefited from the Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative, which is a joint UNODC and World Bank initiative designed to prevent the laundering of stolen assets and facilitate their recovery.

III. Progress towards graduation and smooth transition

106. The triennial review of the list of least developed countries conducted by the Committee for Development Policy in 2012 indicated that six least developed countries meet the criteria for graduation. These countries either exceed the

graduation thresholds for two out of the three least developed country criteria, namely gross national income per capita, the human assets index and the economic vulnerability index, or meet the income criteria only with gross international income per capita of more than twice the graduation threshold. Samoa continues to meet the graduation criteria and will graduate in 2014. Equatorial Guinea is again exceeding the threshold for the income criteria only, after having been recommended for graduation by the Economic and Social Council in 2009. Tuvalu and Vanuatu are meeting the criteria for the third time, both exceeding the income threshold and the threshold for the human assets index. Kiribati is exceeding the income and human assets index thresholds, while Angola is meeting the income criteria only. Both have therefore reached graduation thresholds for the first time.

107. In its resolution 65/171, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to report on the national transition strategies of graduating countries and the support measures provided by development and trading partners. In its resolution 59/209, the Assembly identified broad areas of international support in which smooth transition measures are recommended. These smooth transition measures include the extension of duty-free quota-free market access through the "Everything but arms" initiative for at least three additional years after graduation by the European Union. The Board of the Enhanced Integrated Framework decided to extend access to the programme to graduated countries by three years, with the possibility of extension on a case-by-case basis. Similarly, access to the Least Developed Countries Fund of GEF can be extended to graduated countries for projects already in the pipeline. In 2011, the General Assembly decided, in its resolution 65/286, to extend United Nations travel-related support, within existing resources, to graduated least developed countries for a period appropriate to their development situation and for a maximum of three years.

108. UNCTAD and the respective United Nations regional commissions supported graduating countries in the formulation and adoption of transition strategies by analysing the extent to which retaining least developed country-specific treatment is deemed vital for the continuation of the development progress. A significant number of multilateral and bilateral partners were involved in the consultations with development and trading partners on the transition strategy of Cape Verde and the Maldives.

109. In 2006, Cape Verde set up a donor support group to prepare its transition strategy, with support from UNDP. It adopted a declaration supporting Cape Verde's socioeconomic transformation agenda based on studies on the economic impact of the country's graduation in 2007. Total ODA to Cape Verde increased from $172 million in 2007 to $337 million in 2010, with some partners scaling down their assistance and others maintaining or increasing previous levels. The European Union extended "Everything but arms" treatment for two additional years — until January 2012 — after the expiration of the general three-year extension. Some other trading partners have extended or phased out trade preferences to Cape Verde. Cape Verde's access to the Enhanced Integrated Framework was extended for three years. For the Maldives, there was a less formal process but several trading partners extended trade preferences and access to the Enhanced Integrated Framework was prolonged. Samoa has started the process of developing a transition strategy.

110. At the time countries are recommended for graduation, they are still highly vulnerable and face structural handicaps, despite considerable progress made in

addressing these challenges. However, there is a lack of clarity regarding what support graduated countries will receive from their development and trading partners. The implementation of General Assembly resolution 59/209 has been limited, leaving all initiatives to graduating countries, and there is virtually no monitoring of the process of smooth transition.

111. To address these shortcomings, the General Assembly adopted resolution 66/213 in December 2011, establishing an ad hoc open-ended working group to further study and strengthen the smooth transition process for the countries graduating from the least developed country category. The working group held several substantive meetings in 2012.

IV. Conclusions and policy recommendations

112. **In line with the ambitious goal of the Istanbul Programme of Action of half of the least developed countries reaching the criteria for graduation, stronger incentives for graduating countries and the strengthening of the graduation process are needed. On the one hand, development and trading partners should consider extending or gradually phasing out least developed country-specific support measures for all graduated countries in the areas of financial and technical support and trade. On the other hand, graduating countries should be supported in formulating, implementing and monitoring their smooth transition strategies. The General Assembly may therefore wish to consider the adoption of a resolution building on the recommendations of the ad hoc working group on smooth transition.**

113. **Although the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries was held Only a year ago, both least developed countries and development partners have started mainstreaming the Istanbul Programme of Action into both their national development and development cooperation strategies. Least developed countries should take the lead in further mainstreaming the Programme of Action into national strategies so as to fully implement it. Similarly, development partners should give priority to least developed countries and align their support with least developed country priorities, including through South-South and triangular cooperation.**

114. **Many of the relevant organizations of the United Nations system have taken decisions to implement the Istanbul Programme of Action and have organized several meetings in this respect. To accelerate the mainstreaming of the Programme of Action, further support from the United Nations system is needed, including at the national level. Wider recognition of least developed country status, including by international financial institutions, would also stimulate and facilitate better mainstreaming of the Programme of Action.**

115. **Similarly, other stakeholders, including parliaments, civil society and the private sector have started the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action within their respective areas. However, these processes need to be accelerated and better integrated, including through an increased flow of information. In addition, further advocacy activities to enhance knowledge about the content and relevance of the Programme of Action for different stakeholders need to be pursued.**

116. **Progress was made in all the priority areas of the Istanbul Programme of Action in the decade 2001-2010 but, in most cases, the rate of progress is not sufficient to reach the goals and targets. Realizing the overarching goal of the Istanbul Programme of Action would require bold actions by least developed countries and their development partners in implementing the actions agreed upon under the eight priority areas. The following policy conclusions can be drawn from the current trends described above:**

(a) **Increasing productive capacity, including in the agricultural sector, needs to be at the centre of the development strategies of least developed countries and should be supported by development partners, with a focus on infrastructure development, institutional reforms and employment generation policies;**

(b) **Increasing access to knowledge and technology is crucial for structural transformation, with high priority for the establishment of a technology bank and a science, technology and innovation support mechanism;**

(c) **The commitments on duty-free quota-free market access, reduction of non-tariff barriers, Aid for Trade and the recent WTO decisions need to be implemented on a priority basis;**

(d) **Human and social development needs to be strengthened further by focusing on the quality of service delivery and improved coverage of social protection schemes. Special attention needs to be given to inequalities with respect to location, gender and social and economic status;**

(e) **Resilience to economic and natural shocks needs to be increased including through targeted, timely and adequate support to the least developed countries, peer-learning and experience-sharing on shock management and the promotion of economic diversification;**

(f) **The operationalization of the Green Climate Fund and the allocation of a minimum amount of resources for least developed countries need to be accelerated and other resources for the adaptation of least developed countries to climate change need to be increased;**

(g) **Climate change research should be supported to better understand global and regional climate change effects, and green technology, including for renewable energy production, should be made available to least developed countries;**

(h) **Efforts to increase the volume and quality of financial support need to be stepped up. Donor countries and other developing countries that are in a position to do so should set progressive quantitative aid targets for least developed countries reversing the most recent decline in net bilateral ODA flows to this group of countries. The allocation of ODA to individual countries should also take into account their special circumstances and vulnerability. Similarly, ODA should be used to leverage other financing, including FDI and remittances;**

(i) **In addition to further improvements in governance of least developed countries, greater participation and voice of least developed countries in international decision-making processes is needed.**

117. **In order to improve the monitoring of the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action, its priorities should receive full attention at relevant international meetings. Existing platforms to discuss the renewed partnership for least developed countries, such as the Development Cooperation Forum of the Economic and Social Council, should be strengthened. In addition, data availability for the tracking of the goals and targets of the Istanbul Programme of Action needs to be enhanced.**

Annex I

List of indicators for the monitoring, implementation, review and follow-up of the Istanbul Programme of Action

The Istanbul Programme of Action spelled out a vision for securing sustainable growth and development in least developed countries for the next decade, with a focus on eight priority areas for action. Goals and targets, both qualitative and quantitative, are included for each priority area, totalling 47. They are largely in line with the criteria used for the identification of least developed countries, namely per capita income, human assets and economic vulnerability. The Istanbul Programme of Action contains provisions for effective and complementary follow-up and monitoring mechanisms at the national, regional and global levels. These mechanisms can be effective only if backed by indicators for which there are data that are reliable, comparable across time and countries and easy to collect and to interpret.

In consultation with other United Nations and international organizations, the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States established, within the context of the Inter-Agency Consultative Group, a working group on the indicators for the monitoring, follow-up and review of the Istanbul Programme of Action. This working group came up with a list of indicators to measure the rate of progress in achieving the broader objectives and the 47 goals and targets of the eight priority areas of the Programme of Action.

Three main considerations underpinned the selection of the proposed indicators. First was the attempt to rely on well-established indicators. This implied selecting indicators that had already been used for other global frameworks. Where the existing frameworks did not offer the right indicators, efforts were made to identify indicators that could not only provide relevant and clear measures of the goal or target of interest but were also anchored on international standards, recommendations and best practices. The third and last consideration was to ensure, as much as possible, that the selected indicators captured not only outcomes and outputs but also inputs, therefore making it possible to assess efforts deployed by various stakeholders in living up to their respective commitments.

In total, 121 distinct quantitative indicators were identified for the 47 goals and targets of the Istanbul Programme of Action. In addition to these 121 quantitative indicators, 3 additional indicators were exceptionally proposed for the monitoring of the first objective of the Programme of Action. No indicator was specifically recommended for the other four objectives, since their content is to a large degree reflected in the eight priority areas for action.

In addition to the 124 quantitative indicators proposed for the 8 priority areas and for the first objective of the Programme of Action, qualitative information is also used to monitor the rate of progress in achieving the goals and targets.

A file describing all the proposed indicators and a set of tables with available data for these indicators are posted on the website of the Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States at http://www.unohrlls.org/en/ldc/962/.

Owing to space limitations, only a selected number of indicators are included in the present report.

Data

The tables contained in the present annex were largely compiled from official, published international sources by the United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States. The published sources are cited with each table. Since national data sources have improved, international estimates were rarely used, except to adjust national data for comparability. Where sources made retrospective adjustments to data, the newer data were incorporated in the tables. As a result, some of the data may differ from those published in previous years.

Where shown, totals and averages for the least developed countries and developing regions are weighted by absolute numbers of population or economic variable used in the denominator.

Explanatory notes for tables

1. Years separated by a hyphen (such as 2001-2010) indicate data based on averages in the period shown, unless otherwise indicated in the notes to the tables. Years separated by a slash (such as 2009/2010) indicate that data are shown for the latest year available in the period.

2. Figures may not add to totals, owing to rounding.

Statistical tables

Table 1
Economic growth and poverty

	Annual growth rate of GDP (in constant United States dollars) (percentage)				*Percentage of population below international poverty line*
	2001-2004	*2005-2009*	*2010*	*2001-2010*	*2001/2010*
Africa					
Angola	9.56	13.62	2.30	10.84	54.3
Benin	3.83	4.40	3.00	3.49	47.3
Burkina Faso	5.78	4.40	9.24	5.03	56.5
Burundi	2.65	4.18	3.90	2.94	81.3
Central African Republic	-2.47	2.80	3.30	0.92	62.6
Chad	18.48	-0.40	4.30	7.19	61.9
Comoros	2.11	1.13	2.10	1.71	46.1
Democratic Republic of the Congo	5.29	5.08	7.24	4.97	59.2
Djibouti	3.21	5.17	—	3.71	18.8
Equatorial Guinea	23.39	9.42	0.95	11.55	—
Eritrea	0.57	-1.50	2.20	0.04	—
Ethiopia	4.10	10.46	10.14	7.54	47.3
Gambia	3.44	4.56	5.01	3.25	34.3
Guinea	3.83	2.21	1.93	2.52	56.7
Guinea-Bissau	-2.18	2.89	3.47	1.25	48.8
Lesotho	28.87	4.12	3.30	10.32	43.4
Liberia	-9.92	7.21	5.51	0.71	83.7
Madagascar	0.30	3.34	1.57	2.03	72.1
Malawi	4.22	7.42	7.10	5.17	73.9
Mali	4.57	4.77	4.50	4.33	1.5
Mauritania	3.94	3.58	5.01	3.65	56.3
Mozambique	7.57	7.31	7.20	6.73	21.2
Niger	2.78	4.11	8.81	3.79	55.1
Rwanda	6.81	7.46	7.50	6.68	54.5
Sao Tome and Principe	7.84	5.61	4.50	5.59	—
Senegal	4.37	3.29	4.17	3.59	28.6
Sierra Leone	14.41	5.60	4.95	7.68	38.9
Somalia	—	—	—	—	—

	Annual growth rate of GDP (in constant United States dollars) (percentage)				*Percentage of population below international poverty line*
	2001-2004	*2005-2009*	*2010*	*2001-2010*	*2001/2010*
Sudan	4.75	8.03	4.45	5.68	—
Togo	3.28	2.98	3.37	2.63	38.7
Uganda	7.33	8.78	5.18	6.83	45.9
United Republic of Tanzania	7.29	6.83	6.98	6.33	78.2
Zambia	4.59	6.13	7.61	5.10	64.5
Average, Africa	**5.94**	**7.84**	**5.38**	**7.21**	**53.8**
Asia and Pacific					
Afghanistan	11.85	11.37	8.20	11.48	—
Bangladesh	5.30	6.25	6.07	5.28	53.7
Bhutan	8.11	8.92	7.44	7.70	26.2
Cambodia	8.39	6.85	5.96	7.17	34.3
Kiribati	2.07	0.13	1.80	1.40	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	6.05	7.77	9.44	6.58	39.0
Myanmar	12.71	11.48	10.42	10.86	67.4
Nepal	3.37	4.32	4.55	3.39	—
Samoa	5.26	0.69	1.71	2.24	76.7
Solomon Islands	-0.02	5.84	7.00	4.39	53.4
Timor-Leste	-1.66	5.34	7.42	4.14	45.2
Tuvalu	3.35	3.01	-1.87	0.66	—
Vanuatu	0.00	5.86	3.05	3.51	—
Yemen	3.89	3.48	—	3.38	17.5
Average, Asia and the Pacific	**5.78**	**6.21**	**6.03**	**6.19**	**50.44**
Haiti	-1.15	2.33	-5.05	0.23	54.9
Average, all least developed countries	**5.61**	**7.00**	**5.49**	**6.6**	**52.5**

Source: United Nations Statistics Division (http://unstats.un.org/unsd/databases.htm).
Note: Figures for the proportion of population below the poverty line are averages of all available observations between 2001 and 2010.

Table 2
Productive capacity

	Value added share of manufacturing (per cent of GDP)			*Value added share of agriculture (per cent of GDP)*			*Value added share of services (per cent of GDP)*			*Average annual growth of electricity production per capita (percentage)*
	2001	*2009/2010*	*2001-2010*	*2000*	*2009/2010*	*2001-2010*	*2000*	*2009/2010*	*2001-2010*	*2001-2009*
Africa										
Angola	3.87	5.79	4.51	8.16	10.00	8.42	26.96	27.14	25.10	8.88
Benin	9.19	—	8.28	35.53	—	33.13	50.03	—	53.16	5.23
Burkina Faso	12.98	—	14.12	36.62	—	34.55	44.13	—	43.74	—
Burundi	8.77	—	8.60	39.52	—	39.01	41.45	—	41.89	—
Central African Republic	6.84	—	7.24	54.30	56.48	55.15	30.08	28.71	30.17	—
Chad	9.56	—	6.98	41.81	—	23.55	44.61	—	35.95	—
Comoros	4.57	4.29	4.33	49.96	46.31	48.36	38.32	41.58	39.75	—
Democratic Republic of the Congo	4.86	5.49	5.83	59.74	42.91	47.31	20.09	33.05	27.95	0.49
Djibouti	2.61	—	2.59	3.54	—	3.61	80.81	—	80.07	—
Equatorial Guinea	6.18	13.58	8.49	7.20	3.18	4.05	4.26	4.22	3.71	—
Eritrea	10.54	5.65	8.06	17.90	14.53	18.48	60.22	63.03	59.48	-0.68
Ethiopia	5.72	5.24	5.07	47.67	47.68	46.05	39.31	38.03	40.76	6.79
Gambia	5.19	4.96	5.13	36.26	26.93	30.26	50.83	57.34	55.42	—
Guinea	4.20	4.76	4.04	22.02	13.03	22.00	43.49	39.59	37.48	—
Guinea-Bissau	10.16	—	10.38	51.41	—	54.35	35.77	—	32.67	—
Lesotho	19.32	15.65	19.90	13.19	7.90	9.34	53.20	57.93	55.78	—
Liberia	7.09	—	10.29	73.30	—	65.96	17.15	—	20.27	—
Madagascar	12.43	14.14	13.79	27.89	29.11	28.11	57.52	54.89	56.26	—
Malawi	11.53	10.05	10.44	38.78	30.53	33.40	44.53	53.36	49.51	—
Mali	3.09	—	3.12	37.80	—	36.86	35.84	—	38.15	—
Mauritania	6.72	3.95	4.90	26.98	20.16	22.24	46.61	42.83	43.60	—
Mozambique	13.89	13.08	14.96	22.51	31.85	28.21	51.68	44.76	46.71	1.95
Niger	6.56	—	6.50	40.01	—	39.74	43.00	—	43.23	—

	Value added share of manufacturing (per cent of GDP)			*Value added share of agriculture (per cent of GDP)*			*Value added share of services (per cent of GDP)*			*Average annual growth of electricity production per capita (percentage)*
	2001	*2009/2010*	*2001-2010*	*2000*	*2009/2010*	*2001-2010*	*2000*	*2009/2010*	*2001-2010*	*2001-2009*
Rwanda	6.91	6.36	6.64	37.34	33.85	36.34	48.51	51.75	49.74	—
Sao Tome and Principe	5.70	—	6.13	19.68	—	20.01	63.46	—	61.33	—
Senegal	16.90	12.77	14.87	18.51	16.71	16.11	56.96	61.14	60.37	2.49
Sierra Leone	2.98	—	3.31	47.07	48.97	49.05	27.20	30.37	27.24	—
Somalia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sudan	7.92	5.62	6.84	42.82	23.63	32.86	38.03	43.33	40.21	8.77
Togo	8.89	—	9.36	37.74	—	40.28	45.03	—	38.81	-1.94
Uganda	7.53	8.31	7.63	29.69	24.25	25.13	47.74	50.28	50.10	—
United Republic of Tanzania	8.98	9.83	8.93	32.87	28.15	31.00	47.83	47.31	46.39	3.81
Zambia	11.08	9.16	11.03	22.12	9.16	20.70	52.30	53.61	46.90	0.80
Average, Africa	**8.27**	**7.62**	**8.01**	**32.47**	**24.46**	**27.87**	**41.84**	**42.04**	**40.82**	**2.94**
Asia and the Pacific										
Afghanistan	—	13.12	15.17	—	29.92	36.51	—	47.92	40.12	—
Bangladesh	15.61	17.89	16.86	24.10	18.59	20.49	49.96	52.96	52.07	8.73
Bhutan	8.30	8.43	8.01	27.66	18.75	23.20	35.81	38.08	36.72	—
Cambodia	17.67	15.62	17.96	36.17	36.02	33.63	40.35	40.73	41.04	9.30
Kiribati	4.88	6.20	5.12	22.58	28.62	26.17	65.84	61.84	64.79	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	17.91	7.64	12.81	51.25	33.03	40.72	25.06	36.77	32.90	—
Myanmar	7.83	19.52	13.45	57.07	36.36	45.92	32.35	37.64	35.63	2.18
Nepal	9.29	6.64	8.00	37.64	36.08	35.83	44.56	48.49	46.87	4.46
Samoa	16.00	10.04	13.98	14.89	9.77	12.62	58.02	61.98	58.18	—
Solomon Islands	7.93	3.76	5.61	24.01	38.94	36.35	63.69	55.00	55.03	—
Timor-Leste	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tuvalu	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vanuatu	4.50	3.04	3.92	23.53	19.71	21.80	67.42	70.40	69.66	—

	Value added share of manufacturing (per cent of GDP)			*Value added share of agriculture (per cent of GDP)*			*Value added share of services (per cent of GDP)*			*Average annual growth of electricity production per capita (percentage)*
	2001	*2009/2010*	*2001-2010*	*2060*	*2009/2010*	*2001-2010*	*2000*	*2009/2010*	*2001-2010*	*2001-2009*
Yemen	5.32	—	5.08	11.49	—	12.30	46.86	—	47.01	4.75
Average, Asia and the Pacific	**15.15**	**16.38**	**15.89**	**26.97**	**21.82**	**23.41**	**48.01**	**51.23**	**50.23**	**7.41**
Haiti	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.99
Average, all least developed countries	**10.58**	**11.54**	**11.03**	**29.21**	**23.27**	**25.84**	**44.47**	**46.06**	**44.58**	**4.83**

Source: World Development Indicators of the World Bank (http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators) and United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) (http://www.unido.org/index.php?id=4835&ucg_no64=1/data/ida.cfm).

Table 3
Agriculture, food security and rural development

	Malnutrition prevalence among children under age 5 (percentage)		*Agricultural irrigated land (percentage of total agricultural land)*		*Value added share of agriculture, percentage difference*
	2000/2001	*2006/2009*	*2004*	*2007/2009*	*2001/2002-2009/2010*
Africa					
Angola	27.50	—	—	—	1.84
Benin	21.50	20.20	—	—	—
Burkina Faso	—	26.00	—	—	—
Burundi	38.90	—	—	—	—
Central African Republic	21.80	—	—	—	2.18
Chad	29.40	—	—	—	—
Comoros	25.00	—	—	—	-3.65
Democratic Republic of the Congo	33.60	28.20	—	—	-16.84
Djibouti	—	29.60	—	—	—
Equatorial Guinea	15.70	—	—	—	-4.02
Eritrea	—	—	—	—	-3.37
Ethiopia	42.00	—	0.37	0.49	0.02
Gambia	15.40	15.80	—	—	-9.33
Guinea	29.10	20.80	—	—	-9.00
Guinea-Bissau	21.90	17.40	—	—	—
Lesotho	15.00	—	—	—	-5.28
Liberia	22.80	20.40	—	—	—
Madagascar	—	—	2.18	2.18	1.22
Malawi	21.50	15.50	—	0.53	-8.26
Mali	30.10	27.90	—	—	—
Mauritania	30.40	16.70	—	—	-6.82
Mozambique	—	—	—	—	9.35
Niger	43.60	39.90	—	—	—
Rwanda	20.30	—	—	—	-3.48
Sao Tome and Principe	10.10	13.10	—	—	—
Senegal	20.30	—	0.69	—	-1.80
Sierra Leone	24.70	21.30	—	—	1.89
Somalia	22.80	32.80	—	—	—
Sudan	38.40	31.70	1.23	1.04	-19.19
Togo	—	22.30	—	—	—
Uganda	19.00	16.40	—	—	-5.44

	Malnutrition prevalence among children under age 5 (percentage)		*Agricultural irrigated land (percentage of total agricultural land)*		*Value added share of agriculture, percentage difference*
	2000/2001	*2006/2009*	*2004*	*2007/2009*	*2001/2002-2009/2010*
United Republic of Tanzania	—	—	—	—	-4.72
Zambia	—	14.90	—	—	-12.96
Average, Africa	**28.37**	**20.22**	**0.85**	**0.81**	**-8.01**
Asia and the Pacific					
Afghanistan	—	—	5.50	4.84	-15.24
Bangladesh	45.40	41.30	51.35	—	-5.51
Bhutan	—	12.00	6.79	6.76	-8.91
Cambodia	39.50	28.80	—	—	-0.15
Kiribati	—	—	—	—	6.03
Lao People's Democratic Republic	36.40	31.60	—	—	-18.22
Myanmar	30.10	—	23.20	24.76	-20.71
Nepal	43.00	38.80	27.74	27.74	-1.56
Samoa	—	—	—	—	-5.11
Solomon Islands	—	11.50	—	—	14.93
Timor-Leste	—	—	—	—	—
Tuvalu	—	1.60	—	—	—
Vanuatu	—	11.70	—	—	-3.82
Yemen	—	—	2.87	—	—
Average, Asia and the Pacific	**45.02**	**27.79**	**37.71**	**19.89**	**-5.09**
Haiti	13.90	18.90	—	—	—
Average, all least developed countries	**38.10**	**23.64**	**23.22**	**8.76**	**-5.94**

Source: World Development Indicators (http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators).
Note: For the indicator "value added share of agriculture, percentage change" a negative sign indicates that the value added share decreased over the period 2001/2002-2009/2010. The Asian and Pacific and all least developed country averages of the indicator "Agricultural irrigated land" are not directly comparable over time, since data for Bangladesh for 2007/2009 are not available.

Table 4
Trade and commodities

	Share of least developed countries exports in world total exports (percentage)			*Exports of primary commodities, percentage of total exports*		
	2001	*2005*	*2010*	*2001*	*2005*	*2009/2010*
Africa						
Angola	0.1055	0.2299	0.3511	—	—	—
Benin	0.0060	0.0055	0.0079	82.89	90.77	—
Burkina Faso	0.0036	0.0045	0.0085	82.95	92.28	90.92
Burundi	0.0006	0.0006	0.0007	—	93.66	93.85
Central African Republic	0.0023	0.0012	0.0009	50.96	62.18	—
Chad	0.0031	0.0294	0.0226	—	—	—
Comoros	0.0003	0.0001	0.0001	96.04	—	—
Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.0142	0.0229	0.0348	—	—	—
Djibouti	0.0005	0.0004	0.0006	—	—	7.23
Equatorial Guinea	0.0280	0.0673	0.0689	—	—	—
Eritrea	0.0003	0.0001	0.0001	49.28	—	—
Ethiopia	0.0073	0.0086	0.0147	86.57	—	90.18
Gambia	0.0002	0.0001	0.0001	96.38	—	60.89
Guinea	0.0118	0.0081	0.0082	71.67	87.42	—
Guinea-Bissau	0.0010	0.0009	0.0008	—	—	—
Lesotho	0.0045	0.0062	0.0054	17.30	—	—
Liberia	0.0021	0.0013	0.0015	—	—	—
Madagascar	0.0150	0.0081	0.0072	54.26	43.85	45.97
Malawi	0.0073	0.0049	0.0070	89.76	83.55	91.03
Mali	0.0117	0.0105	0.0154	76.48	82.63	78.55
Mauritania	0.0057	0.0060	0.0133	—	—	88.30
Mozambique	0.0114	0.0170	0.0210	89.94	93.47	94.21
Niger	—	—	—	91.69	83.65	85.34
Rwanda	0.0014	0.0012	0.0020	97.32	96.60	92.36
Sao Tome and Principe	0.0000	0.0001	0.0001	—	—	—
Senegal	0.0162	0.0150	0.0142	70.80	54.78	59.81
Sierra Leone	0.0005	0.0015	0.0022	—	—	—
Somalia	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sudan	0.0274	0.0460	0.0751	98.66	99.36	99.30
Togo	0.0058	0.0063	0.0053	50.32	41.89	25.66
Uganda	0.0073	0.0077	0.0106	94.46	88.45	77.12
United Republic of Tanzania	0.0138	0.0160	0.0242	83.30	85.73	75.56

	Share of least developed countries exports in world total exports (percentage)			*Exports of primary commodities, percentage of total exports*		
	2001	*2005*	*2010*	*2001*	*2005*	*2009/2010*
Zambia	0.0159	0.0173	0.0473	85.53	91.20	93.36
Average, Africa	**0.3308**	**0.5445**	**0.7716**	**83.51**	**84.78**	**77.96**
Asia and the Pacific						
Afghanistan	0.0011	0.0037	0.0028	—	—	—
Bangladesh	0.0982	0.0886	0.1259	7.22	8.71	—
Bhutan	—	—	—	—	50.19	30.49
Cambodia	0.0242	0.0295	0.0330	3.58	2.52	3.85
Kiribati	0.0001	0.0000	0.0001	—	85.58	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.0052	0.0053	0.0105	—	—	—
Myanmar	0.0385	0.0364	0.0574	—	—	—
Nepal	0.0119	0.0082	0.0056	—	—	27.74
Samoa	0.0010	0.0008	0.0004	32.77	23.32	21.71
Solomon Islands	0.0008	0.0010	0.0015	—	—	—
Timor-Leste	0.0000	0.0001	0.0001	—	96.38	—
Tuvalu	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	—	—	—
Vanuatu	0.0003	0.0004	0.0003	—	—	—
Yemen	0.0545	0.0535	0.0571	97.57	98.40	98.32
Average, Asia and the Pacific	**0.0842**	**0.0766**	**0.1072**	**7.21**	**9.27**	**16.79**
Haiti	0.0044	0.0045	0.0038	—	—	—
Average, all least developed countries	**0.4194**	**0.6256**	**0.8826**	**55.34**	**53.94**	**67.28**

Source: World Development Indicators (http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators) and World Trade Organization (WTO) (http://stat.wto.org/Home/WSDBHome.aspx?Language=).

Note: The figures for Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and all least developed countries are group totals in the first three columns and group averages in the last three columns.

Table 5
Human development (education and training)

	Gross intake primary education (percentage)			*Gross enrolment in secondary education*			*Pupil/teacher ratio in primary education*			*Pupil/teacher ratio in secondary education*		
	2001	*2005*	*2010/2011*	*2001*	*2005*	*2010/2011*	*2001*	*2005*	*2010/2011*	*2001*	*2005*	*2010/2011*
Africa												
Angola	—	—	165	17	16	31	—	—	46	19	—	39
Benin	106	112	153	25	37	—	54	47	46	22	—	—
Burkina Faso	47	72	89	10	13	23	47	47	48	—	—	26
Burundi	76	94	161	11	14	25	50	49	51	—	23	30
Central African Republic	—	68	107	12	—	13	—	89	84	—	—	52
Chad	80	98	119	13	16	26	71	63	56	36	34	32
Comoros	101	89	—	—	46	—	38	35	—	—	14	—
Democratic Republic of the Congo	—	—	111	—	—	38	—	—	37	—	—	16
Djibouti	37	46	60	16	23	36	—	35	35	—	—	28
Equatorial Guinea	—	93	92	28	—	—	43	—	27	—	—	—
Eritrea	62	59	42	25	30	32	45	48	38	52	51	39
Ethiopia	84	143	137	17	25	36	—	—	54	—	—	43
Gambia	99	92	88	—	—	54	39	37	—	—	—	—
Guinea	65	87	104	19	31	—	44	45	42	—	34	—
Guinea-Bissau	—	—	166	—	34	—	—	—	52	—	—	—
Lesotho	128	100	99	32	37	46	47	42	34	—	17	—
Liberia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Madagascar	113	184	184	—	22	—	47	54	40	—	22	—
Malawi	189	163	154	33	28	32	—	—	79	—	—	—
Mali	61	69	79	—	24	39	63	54	48	—	—	25
Mauritania	96	117	105	21	23	24	42	40	37	26	31	—
Mozambique	118	145	164	7	13	25	66	66	58	—	32	35
Niger	47	62	95	7	10	13	42	44	39	24	27	30
Rwanda	122	191	184	11	16	32	51	69	65	26	29	29
Sao Tome and Principe	116	110	112	—	46	59	34	31	30	—	22	20
Senegal	80	94	103	17	23	37	51	42	34	25	26	32
Sierra Leone	—	—	127	28	—	—	37	—	31	27	—	—

	Gross intake primary education (percentage)			*Gross enrolment in secondary education*			*Pupil/teacher ratio in primary education*			*Pupil/teacher ratio in secondary education*		
	2001	*2005*	*2010/2011*	*2001*	*2005*	*2010/2011*	*2001*	*2005*	*2010/2011*	*2001*	*2005*	*2010/2011*
Somalia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sudan	52	60	—	29	32	—	24	29	—	22	22	—
Togo	108	107	154	80	—	—	18	—	—	—	—	—
Uganda	180	159	155	—	—	—	46	56	51	—	—	—
United Republic of Tanzania	109	108	96	34	55	56	51	—	30	28	24	23
Zambia	92	128	115	—	—	—	55	66	58	—	—	—
Average, Africa	**94**	**111**	**131**	**21**	**27**	**35**	**47**	**50**	**47**	**26**	**26**	**31**
Asia and the Pacific												
Afghanistan	—	84	108	11	17	46	—	—	44	—	—	—
Bangladesh	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	47	43	37	24	28
Bhutan	83	100	102	44	45	70	39	31	25	32	28	21
Cambodia	146	137	143	19	35	46	53	53	48	20	—	—
Kiribati	113	133	—	79	88	—	24	25	—	21	17	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	116	121	—	37	45	—	30	31	—	23	25	—
Myanmar	141	133	152	40	47	54	32	31	28	31	33	34
Nepal	108	—	—	38	46	—	37	40	30	33	—	—
Samoa	114	—	125	80	84	85	25	—	30	21	—	21
Solomon Islands	—	—	—	25	31	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Timor-Leste	—	111	141	36	47	—	34	34	41	—	31	—
Tuvalu	107	99	—	16	19	28	54	50	49	18	19	—
Vanuatu	129	—	124	36	—	55	24	—	22	15	—	—
Yemen	92	115	103	45	46	44	—	—	31	—	—	—
Average, Asia and the Pacific	**121**	**126**	**134**	**31**	**38**	**50**	**36**	**43**	**39**	**34**	**26**	**30**
Haiti	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Average, all least developed countries	**97**	**113**	**132**	**25**	**31**	**39**	**44**	**47**	**44**	**31**	**26**	**31**

Source: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) (http://www.uis.unesco.org/Pages/default.aspx).

Table 6
Human development (education and training — female to male ratios)

	Female to male ratio in primary education			*Female to male ratio in secondary education*			*Female to male ratio in tertiary education*		
	2001	*2005*	*2010/2011*	*2001*	*2005*	*2010/2011*	*2001*	*2005*	*2010/2011*
Africa									
Angola	—	—	0.81	0.79	—	0.69	—	—	0.83
Benin	0.68	0.77	0.87	0.47	0.55	—	0.25	—	—
Burkina Faso	0.70	0.78	0.89	0.64	0.69	0.75	0.34	0.44	0.47
Burundi	0.80	0.86	0.99	0.79	0.74	0.72	0.37	0.38	0.55
Central African Republic	0.69	0.70	0.72	—	—	0.59	—	—	0.32
Chad	0.63	0.67	0.73	0.30	0.34	0.41	0.18	0.06	0.17
Comoros	0.81	0.86	—	—	0.74	—	—	—	0.72
Democratic Republic of the Congo	—	—	0.86	—	—	0.57	—	—	—
Djibouti	0.75	0.80	0.89	0.61	0.65	0.78	0.72	0.72	0.66
Equatorial Guinea	0.95	0.95	0.96	—	—	—	—	—	—
Eritrea	0.82	0.80	0.82	0.71	0.59	0.70	0.15	—	0.33
Ethiopia	0.68	0.82	0.90	0.66	0.59	0.81	0.27	0.32	0.36
Gambia	0.90	1.02	1.01	—	—	0.95	—	—	—
Guinea	0.70	0.79	0.81	0.39	0.49	—	—	0.23	—
Guinea-Bissau	—	—	0.94	—	—	—	0.19	—	—
Lesotho	1.01	0.99	0.96	1.27	1.26	1.36	1.74	1.32	—
Liberia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Madagascar	0.96	0.96	0.98	—	0.96	—	0.83	0.89	0.91
Malawi	0.96	1.01	1.02	0.77	0.81	0.90	0.41	0.55	0.61
Mali	0.71	0.77	0.85	—	0.60	0.68	0.49	0.53	0.40
Mauritania	0.93	1.00	1.02	0.75	0.85	0.82	0.20	0.33	0.39
Mozambique	0.77	0.84	0.90	0.63	0.69	0.82	—	0.50	—
Niger	0.65	0.69	0.79	0.64	0.64	0.66	—	0.42	0.42
Rwanda	1.00	1.04	1.03	1.01	0.89	1.03	0.51	—	0.78
Sao Tome and Principe	0.92	0.95	0.95	—	1.05	1.12	—	—	0.95
Senegal	0.87	0.95	1.04	0.65	0.74	0.86	—	—	0.59
Sierra Leone	0.71	—	0.95	0.71	—	—	0.40	—	—
Somalia	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

A/67/88
E/2012/75

	Female to male ratio in primary education			*Female to male ratio in secondary education*			*Female to male ratio in tertiary education*		
	2001	*2005*	*2010/2011*	*2001*	*2005*	*2010/2011*	*2001*	*2005*	*2010/2011*
Sudan	0.82	0.84	—	0.93	0.91	—	—	—	—
Togo	1.01	0.94	—	0.86	—	—	—	—	—
Uganda	0.97	0.96	1.00	—	—	—	0.31	0.48	0.82
United Republic of Tanzania	—	0.88	0.92	—	0.95	0.96	—	—	—
Zambia	0.93	0.95	1.00	—	—	—	—	—	—
Average, Africa	**0.80**	**0.86**	**0.90**	**0.71**	**0.73**	**0.76**	**0.38**	**0.44**	**0.54**
Asia and the Pacific									
Afghanistan	—	0.55	0.65	—	0.30	0.47	—	—	—
Bangladesh	—	1.00	1.02	1.04	1.02	1.07	0.51	0.50	—
Bhutan	0.88	0.95	0.99	0.83	0.89	1.02	0.51	0.53	0.66
Cambodia	0.86	0.90	0.92	0.55	0.72	0.86	0.38	0.46	—
Kiribati	0.97	0.98	—	1.13	1.08	—	—	—	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.83	0.85	—	0.69	0.74	—	0.58	0.70	—
Myanmar	0.97	0.99	0.98	0.94	0.97	1.05	—	—	—
Nepal	0.79	0.86	1.02	0.67	0.81	—	0.26	—	0.68
Samoa	0.93	—	0.93	1.02	1.03	1.03	0.80	—	—
Solomon Islands	0.86	0.88	—	0.75	0.77	—	—	—	—
Timor-Leste	0.79	0.85	0.90	0.46	0.53	—	—	—	—
Tuvalu	0.96	0.98	1.00	0.77	0.80	0.85	0.53	—	—
Vanuatu	0.92	0.91	0.90	0.86	—	0.95	—	—	—
Yemen	0.60	0.71	0.78	0.39	0.47	0.60	—	0.35	—
Average, Asia and the Pacific	**0.90**	**0.93**	**0.96**	**0.94**	**0.89**	**0.97**	**0.48**	**0.51**	**0.68**
Haiti	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Average, all least developed countries	**0.81**	**0.88**	**0.92**	**0.80**	**0.79**	**0.84**	**0.42**	**0.46**	**0.56**

Source: UNESCO (http://www.uis.unesco.org/Pages/default.aspx).

Table 7
Human development (population and primary health)

	Infant mortality rate (0-1 years) per 1,000 live births			*Maternal mortality rate (0-1 years) per 100,000 births*			*Contraceptive prevalence (percentage of women 15-49)*	*HIV prevalence (population ages 15-49)*		
	2001	*2005*	*2010*	*2000*	*2005*	*2008*	*2001-2010*	*2001*	*2005*	*2009*
Africa										
Angola	116	108	98	880	720	610	6	1.9	1.9	2
Benin	87	81	73	560	460	410	18	1.4	1.3	1.2
Burkina Faso	98	95	93	650	600	560	16	2.1	1.5	1.2
Burundi	99	94	88	1 200	1 100	970	14	5	4	3.3
Central African Republic	114	111	106	900	910	850	19	8 9	6.6	4.7
Chad	105	102	99	1 300	1 200	1 200	3	3.2	3.5	3.4
Comoros	74	69	63	390	360	340	—	0	0	0.1
Democratic Republic of the Congo	117	117	112	850	740	670	26	—	—	—
Djibouti	82	78	73	330	320	300	16	2.9	2.7	2.5
Equatorial Guinea	96	89	81	480	320	280	—	1.9	3.6	5
Eritrea	58	50	42	420	330	280	8	1.2	1	0.8
Ethiopia	85	77	68	750	560	470	,5	0.6	1.1	2
Gambia	65	61	57	560	460	400	18	1.7	1.5	1.3
Guinea	103	93	81	920	780	680	8	2	2.4	2.5
Guinea-Bissau	105	99	92	1 100	1 100	1 000	10	2.6	2.1	1.9
Lesotho	87	83	65	470	570	530	41	3.1	2.2	1.5
Liberia	110	92	74	1 100	1 100	990	11	0.2	0.2	0.2
Madagascar	63	53	43	580	490	440	34	13.8	12.1	11
Malawi	94	77	58	770	620	510	37	0	0	0
Mali	112	106	99	980	880	830	8	1.6	1.2	1
Mauritania	77	76	75	640	590	550	9	0.6	0.7	0.7
Mozambique	117	106	92	780	640	550	16	9.4	11.2	11.5
Niger	95	84	73	1 100	910	820	11	1	0.9	0.8
Rwanda	100	79	59	1 100	720	540	27	3.7	3.1	2.9
Sao Tome and Principe	57	55	53	—	—	—	35	—	—	—
Senegal	62	56	50	560	460	410	12	0.6	0.8	0.9
Sierra Leone	139	128	114	1 300	1 100	970	7	1.1	1.5	1.6

	Infant mortality rate (0-1 years) per 1,000 live births			*Maternal mortality rate (0-1 years) per 100,000 births*			*Contraceptive prevalence (percentage of women 15-49)*	*HIV prevalence (population ages 15-49)*		
	2001	*2005*	*2010*	*2000*	*2005*	*2008*	*2001-2010*	*2001*	*2005*	*2009*
Somalia	108	108	108	1 200	1 200	1 200	15	0.3	0.4	0.7
Sudan	72	69	66	770	760	750	8	0.4	0.6	1.1
Togo	75	71	66	450	380	350	17	3.6	3.4	3.2
Uganda	85	75	63	640	510	430	22	7	6.4	6.5
United Republic of Tanzania	77	65	50	920	860	790	30	7.1	6.2	5.6
Zambia	91	84	69	600	560	470	38	14.3	13.9	13.5
Average, Africa	**92.64**	**85.55**	**76.48**	**811.49**	**698.77**	**628.09**	**23**	**3.88**	**3.76**	**3.77**
Asia and the Pacific										
Afghanistan	104	104	103	1 800	1 500	1 400	16	—	—	—
Bangladesh	60	49	38	500	420	340	56	0	0	0
Bhutan	63	53	44	420	260	200	35	0	0.1	0.2
Cambodia	73	58	43	470	350	290	45	1.2	0.8	0.5
Kiribati	49	44	39	—	—	—	22	0	0.1	0.2
Lao People's Democratic Republic	62	52	42	790	650	580	38	24.5	23.6	23.6
Myanmar	62	57	50	290	250	240	37	0.8	0.7	0.6
Nepal	61	51	41	550	440	380	42	0.5	0.4	0.4
Samoa	19	19	17	—	—	—	29	—	—	—
Solomon Islands	28	26	23	110	110	100	21	—	—	—
Timor-Leste	77	62	46	520	420	370	15	—	—	—
Tuvalu	34	31	27	—	—	—	31	—	—	—
Vanuatu	19	15	12	—	—	—	38	—	—	—
Yemen	70	64	57	340	250	210	25	—	—	—
Average, Asia and the Pacific	**64.15**	**55.72**	**47.26**	**583.19**	**494.08**	**435.91**	**39**	**0.81**	**0.78**	**0.81**
Haiti	76	67	70	450	350	300	32	—	—	—
Average, all least developed countries	**82.00**	**74.67**	**66.33**	**701.04**	**616.58**	**551.97**	**32**	**2.68**	**2.63**	**2.67**

Source: United Nations Statistics Division (http://unstats.un.org/unsd/databases.htm).

Table 8
Human development (youth development)

	Youth literacy (percentage of population ages 15-24)		
	2000/2001	*2009*	*2001-2010*
Africa			
Angola	72.19	73.12	72.66
Benin	—	54.33	49.82
Burkina Faso	—	—	34.48
Burundi	73.33	76.58	76.58
Central African Republic	60.81	64.67	64.67
Chad	37.56	46.26	43.97
Comoros	80.19	85.27	85.27
Democratic Republic of the Congo	70.42	65.42	67.92
Djibouti	—	—	—
Equatorial Guinea	97.13	97.92	97.92
Eritrea	—	88.66	83.30
Ethiopia	—	—	47.25
Gambia	52.56	65.47	65.47
Guinea	—	61.07	54.08
Guinea-Bissau	59.49	70.88	70.88
Lesotho	90.93	91.97	91.97
Liberia	—	75.64	73.38
Madagascar	70.24	64.94	64.94
Malawi	—	86.46	86.46
Mali	—	—	38.82
Mauritania	61.34	67.69	67.69
Mozambique	—	70.87	66.38
Niger	14.00	—	25.27
Rwanda	77.62	77.22	77.22
Sao Tome and Principe	95.42	95.33	95.37
Senegal	—	65.01	55.00
Sierra Leone	—	57.61	52.77
Somalia	—	—	—
Sudan	78.16	85.92	85.92
Togo	—	—	—
Uganda	—	77.42	77.91
United Republic of Tanzania	—	—	—
Zambia	—	74.59	71.84
Average, Africa	**70.80**	**71.80**	**53.24**

	Youth literacy (percentage of population ages 15-24)		
	2000/2001	*2009*	*2001-2010*
Asia and the Pacific			
Afghanistan	—	—	—
Bangladesh	63.62	75.45	69.54
Bhutan	—	—	74.41
Cambodia	—	—	85.43
Kiribati	—	—	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	78.46	—	81.19
Myanmar	94.59	95.69	95.69
Nepal	70.05	81.96	76.00
Samoa	—	99.48	99.43
Solomon Islands	—	—	—
Timor-Leste	74.44	—	76.45
Tuvalu	—	—	82.43
Vanuatu	—	93.96	93.01
Yemen	—	84.12	80.63
Average, Asia and the Pacific	**92.05**	**81.41**	**68.19**
Haiti	—	—	72.35
Average, all least developed countries	**79.11**	**75.82**	**59.81**

Source: UNESCO (http://www.uis.unesco.org/Pages/default.aspx).

Table 9
Human development (shelter, water and sanitation)

	Percentage of population using an improved drinking water source			*Percentage of population using an improved sanitation facility*		
	2000	*2005*	*2008*	*2000*	*2005*	*2008*
Africa						
Angola	41	47	50	40	50	57
Benin	66	72	75	9	11	12
Burkina Faso	60	70	76	8	11	11
Burundi	72	72	72	45	46	46
Central African Republic	63	65	67	22	29	34
Chad	45	49	50	7	9	9
Comoros	92	95	95	28	35	36
Democratic Republic of the Congo	44	45	46	16	20	23
Djibouti	84	89	92	63	58	56
Equatorial Guinea	43	43	—	51	51	—
Eritrea	54	60	61	11	13	14
Ethiopia	28	35	38	8	10	12
Gambia	84	89	92	63	65	67
Guinea	62	68	71	15	17	19
Guinea-Bissau	55	58	61	18	20	21
Lesotho	74	83	85	29	28	29
Liberia	65	67	68	14	16	17
Madagascar	37	40	41	10	11	11
Malawi	63	74	80	50	54	56
Mali	44	51	56	32	35	36
Mauritania	40	45	49	21	24	26
Mozambique	42	45	47	14	15	17
Niger	42	45	48	7	9	9
Rwanda	67	66	65	40	49	54
Sao Tome and Principe	79	85	89	21	24	26
Senegal	65	68	69	45	49	51
Sierra Leone	55	51	49	11	12	13
Somalia	23	28	30	22	22	23
Sudan	61	59	57	34	34	34
Togo	55	58	60	12	12	12
Uganda	57	64	67	44	47	48

	Percentage of population using an improved drinking water source			*Percentage of population using an improved sanitation facility*		
	2000	*2005*	*2008*	*2000*	*2005*	*2008*
United Republic of Tanzania	54	54	54	24	24	24
Zambia	54	58	60	47	47	49
Average, Africa	**48.17**	**51.83**	**53.69**	**22.65**	**25.02**	**26.62**
Asia and the Pacific						
Afghanistan	21	41	48	32	35	37
Bangladesh	79	80	80	44	50	53
Bhutan	91	91	92	62	64	65
Cambodia	46	56	61	17	24	29
Kiribati	62	64	—	33	35	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	48	54	57	26	43	53
Myanmar	66	71	71	65	81	81
Nepal	83	86	88	23	28	31
Samoa	89	88	—	100	100	100
Solomon Islands	70	70	—	31	32	—
Timor-Leste	52	63	69	32	44	50
Tuvalu	94	96	97	83	83	84
Vanuatu	72	79	83	41	48	52
Yemen	65	63	62	37	46	52
Average, Asia and the Pacific	**68.76**	**73.01**	**74.69**	**43.40**	**50.38**	**53.61**
Haiti	55	60	63	22	19	17
Average, all least developed countries	**55.31**	**59.71**	**61.09**	**29.59**	**34.41**	**36.16**

Source: United Nations Statistics Division (http://unstats.un.org/unsd/databases.htm).
Note: Data are available for 2000, 2005 and 2008 only.

Table 10
Human development (gender equality and empowerment of women)

	Percentage of parliamentary seats held by women			*Contraceptive prevalence (women ages 15-49) (point difference)*	*Female to male ratio in primary education (point difference)*	*Female to male ratio in secondary education (point difference)*	*Female to male ratio in tertiary education (point difference)*
	2001	*2005*	*2010*	*2000/2004-2005/2009*	*2000/2004-2005/2009*	*2000/2004-2005/2009*	*2000/2004-2005/2009*
Africa							
Angola	15.5	15.0	38.6	—	—	—	—
Benin	6.0	7.2	10.8	-1.60	0.11	0.09	—
Burkina Faso	8.1	11.7	15.3	3.60	0.10	0.06	0.14
Burundi	14.4	18.4	31.4	-8.60	0.12	-0.05	0.01
Central African Republic	7.3	—	9.6	-8.90	0.02	—	0.17
Chad	2.4	6.5	5.2	—	—	—	—
Comoros	—	3.0	3.0	—	—	—	—
Democratic Republic of the Congo	—	12.0	8.4	-10.80	0.05	-0.03	—
Djibouti	0.0	10.8	13.8	11.15	0.09	0.04	-0.09
Equatorial Guinea	5.0	18.0	10.0	—	—	—	—
Eritrea	14.7	22.0	22.0	—	—	—	—
Ethiopia	7.7	7.7	21.9	6.60	0.16	0.06	0.02
Gambia	2.0	13.2	7.5	—	—	—	—
Guinea	8.8	19.3	—	2.60	0.10	0.12	0.10
Guinea-Bissau	7.8	14.0	10.0	2.70	—	—	—
Lesotho	3.8	11.7	24.2	5.82	-0.02	0.04	-0.31
Liberia	7.8	5.3	12.5	1.40	0.17	—	—
Madagascar	8.0	6.9	—	16.95	0.01	—	0.04
Malawi	9.3	14.0	20.8	9.45	0.04	0.06	0.09
Mali	12.2	10.2	10.2	0.10	0.06	0.07	-0.04
Mauritania	3.8	3.7	22.1	1.30	0.05	0.06	0.10
Mozambique	30.0	34.8	39.2	-0.30	0.08	0.08	0.03

	Percentage of parliamentary seats held by women			Contraceptive prevalence (women ages 15-49) (point difference)	Female to male ratio in primary education (point difference)	Female to male ratio in secondary education (point difference)	Female to male ratio in tertiary education (point difference)
	2001	2005	2010	2000/2004-2005/2009	2000/2004-2005/2009	2000/2004-2005/2009	2000/2004-2005/2009
Niger	1.2	12.4	9.7	-2.80	0.06	-0.01	0.03
Rwanda	25.7	48.8	56.3	13.70	0.03	-0.04	0.21
Sao Tome and Principe	9.1	9.1	7.3	5.25	0.03	-0.02	—
Senegal	12.1	19.2	22.7	—	—	—	—
Sierra Leone	8.8	14.5	13.2	2.45	—	—	—
Somalia	—	—	6.9	—	—	—	—
Sudan	—	9.7	18.9	—	—	—	—
Togo	4.9	6.2	11.1	-8.90	-0.07	—	—
Uganda	17.8	23.9	31.5	-1.10	0.01	—	0.09
United Republic of Tanzania	—	21.4	30.7	-1.80	0.01	0.02	-0.45
Zambia	10.1	12.0	14.0	6.60	0.03	—	—
Average, Africa	**11.9**	**15.7**	**24.7**	**4.33**	**0.07**	**0.05**	**-0.02**
Asia and the Pacific							
Afghanistan	—	—	27.3	10.73	0.13	0.11	-0.04
Bangladesh	9.1	2.0	18.6	-1.75	—	0.01	0.06
Bhutan	9.3	9.3	8.5	4.70	0.09	0.11	0.01
Cambodia	7.4	9.8	21.1	16.20	0.03	0.18	0.11
Kiribati	4.9	4.8	4.3	—	—	—	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	21.2	22.9	25.2	5.80	0.03	0.05	0.15
Myanmar	—	—	—	5.35	0.00	0.03	—
Nepal	5.9	—	33.2	9.70	0.13	0.16	0.34
Samoa	8.2	6.1	8.2	—	—	—	—
Solomon Islands	2.0	0.0	0.0	27.80	0.02	0.02	—
Timor-Leste	—	25.3	29.2	10.80	0.05	0.06	—
Tuvalu	0.0	0.0	0.0	-1.10	0.03	0.03	0.24

	Percentage of parliamentary seats held by women			Contraceptive prevalence (women ages 15-49) (point difference)	Female to male ratio in primary education (point difference)	Female to male ratio in secondary education (point difference)	Female to male ratio in tertiary education (point difference)
	2001	2005	2010	2000/2004-2005/2009	2000/2004-2005/2009	2000/2004-2005/2009	2000/2004-2005/2009
Vanuatu	0.0	3.8	3.8	—	—	—	—
Yemen	0.7	0.3	0.3	4.60	0.11	0.09	0.07
Average, Asia and the Pacific	**8.74**	**3.40**	**19.13**	**-0.48**	**0.10**	**0.00**	**0.14**
Haiti	—	3.6	4.1	3.90	—	—	—
Average, all least developed countries	**9.8**	**10.6**	**22.6**	**3.53**	**0.09**	**0.03**	**0.05**

Sources: UNESCO (http://www.uis.unesco.org/Pages/default.aspx) and United Nations Statistics Division (http://unstats.un.org/unsd/databases.htm).

Table 11
Human development (social protection)

	Public health expenditure (percentage of GDP)	*Public education expenditure (percentage of GDP)*		
	2009	*2001*	*2005*	*2010*
Africa				
Angola	4.09	—	2.56	—
Benin	2.32	3.65	4.07	—
Burkina Faso	3.95	—	4.46	—
Burundi	6.03	3.84	5.10	9.24
Central African Republic	1.66	—	1.64	1.19
Chad	3.86	2.43	2.12	2.78
Comoros	2.09	—	—	—
Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.48	—	—	—
Djibouti	5.38	7.81	8.36	—
Equatorial Guinea	3.39	0.58	—	—
Eritrea	0.98	4.43	—	—
Ethiopia	2.05	3.73	—	4.69
Gambia	3.01	—	—	4.99
Guinea	0.87	2.04	1.85	—
Guinea-Bissau	1.56	—	—	—
Lesotho	5.59	11.14	14.79	—
Liberia	5.24	—	—	—
Madagascar	2.75	3.25	3.85	—
Malawi	3.60	4.51	—	4.64
Mali	2.68	3.50	4.15	4.47
Mauritania	1.57	3.28	—	4.33
Mozambique	4.68	—	5.20	—
Niger	3.51	2.87	—	3.85
Rwanda	3.89	5.67	3.13	4.99
Sao Tome and Principe	2.91	—	—	—
Senegal	3.17	3.29	5.15	5.63
Sierra Leone	1.43	4.65	3.72	—
Somalia	—	—	—	—
Sudan	2.00	—	—	—
Togo	1.31	—	—	—
Uganda	1.56	—	—	6.18

	Public health expenditure (percentage of GDP)	*Public education expenditure (percentage of GDP)*		
	2009	*2001*	*2005*	*2010*
United Republic of Tanzania	3.75	—	—	13.97
Zambia	3.63	1.99	2.01	—
Average, Africa	**2.93**	**3.44**	**3.68**	**7.27**
Asia and the Pacific				
Afghanistan	1.59	—	—	—
Bangladesh	1.12	2.46	—	—
Bhutan	4.50	5.87	7.20	4.02
Cambodia	1.26	1.72	—	2.60
Kiribati	10.33	11.85	—	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.78	1.99	2.43	3.27
Myanmar	0.19	1.26	—	—
Nepal	2.05	3.71	—	4.72
Samoa	6.11	4.29	—	—
Solomon Islands	4.92	—	—	—
Timor-Leste	8.73	4.20	3.41	4.45
Tuvalu	10.48	—	—	—
Vanuatu	2.87	8.95	—	—
Yemen	1.57	9.63	—	—
Average, Asia and the Pacific	**1.41**	**2.73**	**3.14**	**3.57**
Haiti	1.35	—	—	—
Average, all least developed countries	**2.28**	**3.51**	**3.67**	**6.51**

Sources: World Health Organization (WHO) (http://www.who.int/whosis/en/) and UNESCO (http://www.uis.unesco.org/Pages/default.aspx.

Table 12
Multiple crises and emerging challenges

	Total reserves (percentage of external debt)			*Total debt service (percentage of external debt)*		
	2001	*2010*	*2001-2010*	*2001*	*2009/2010*	*2001-2010*
Africa						
Angola	8.68	106.40	55.71	33.01	4.49	12.80
Benin	39.77	98.26	85.92	8.60	2.48	5.11
Burkina Faso	17.46	52.03	43.49	13.69	3.72	8.37
Burundi	1.67	61.83	18.88	49.71	16.58	45.90
Central African Republic	14.78	47.09	20.51	—	—	—
Chad	11.55	36.48	31.01	—	—	3.86
Comoros	26.13	30.09	35.54	—	14.85	16.03
Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.72	22.51	4.00	—	3.76	8.02
Djibouti	27.13	33.14	25.51	4.45	7.48	6.27
Equatorial Guinea	—	—	—	—	—	—
Eritrea	12.75	11.30	6.52	—	—	—
Ethiopia	8.54	—	25.40	18.36	3.00	6.81
Gambia	21.72	42.88	23.81	—	7.24	11.69
Guinea	7.11	—	6.28	12.65	5.65	13.29
Guinea-Bissau	7.69	14.29	9.50	7.05	—	8.41
Lesotho	64.66	—	72.90	12.38	1.94	5.78
Liberia	0.02	—	3.78	—	1.28	35.61
Madagascar	9.59	51.04	29.17	4.99	2.55	3.80
Malawi	7.97	35.30	15.19	9.46	—	9.19
Mali	12.20	57.79	42.60	8.89	2.52	5.40
Mauritania	1.74	11.70	6.86	—	4.81	5.28
Mozambique	15.03	54.93	36.47	8.55	2.94	3.62
Niger	6.71	67.48	34.47	8.19	—	8.99
Rwanda	16.56	102.29	58.59	11.62	2.34	8.40
Sao Tome and Principe	5.03	—	9.24	28.00	6.54	24.80
Senegal	12.42	55.68	42.79	14.53	—	10.35
Sierra Leone	4.26	52.57	23.28	112.17	2.56	16.86
Somalia	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sudan	0.33	4.74	5.61	13.66	4.17	6.93
Togo	8.97	41.38	22.65	7.47	4.37	4.78
Uganda	26.35	94.81	76.07	6.94	1.84	6.04

	Total reserves (percentage of external debt)			*Total debt service (percentage of external debt)*		
	2001	*2010*	*2001-2010*	*2001*	*2009/2010*	*2001-2010*
United Republic of Tanzania	17.89	45.07	37.26	7.78	3.03	3.70
Zambia	3.01	56.76	25.69	17.19	1.91	12.82
Average, Africa	**11.49**	**57.33**	**36.11**	**14.90**	**3.44**	**7.82**
Asia and the Pacific						
Afghanistan	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bangladesh	8.78	44.77	22.30	9.59	4.65	7.00
Bhutan	121.94	111.57	93.67	—	14.12	7.89
Cambodia	25.86	81.63	47.00	1.02	0.83	0.78
Kiribati	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	6.05	19.87	12.96	9.01	14.80	16.69
Myanmar	8.06	—	11.15	1.36	—	1.72
Nepal	39.51	79.01	54.44	7.83	10.48	9.34
Samoa	42.26	68.00	51.46	—	5.24	4.60
Solomon Islands	11.85	123.36	54.40	7.14	5.92	7.35
Timor-Leste	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tuvalu	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vanuatu	52.60	108.84	83.39	0.98	1.65	1.48
Yemen	71.14	93.91	105.44	6.98	2.76	3.82
Average, Asia and the Pacific	**13.51**	**53.53**	**29.47**	**8.85**	**5.23**	**7.06**
Haiti	11.29	271.82	44.62	5.91	15.66	9.85
Average, all least developed countries	**15.73**	**57.74**	**36.61**	**11.89**	**4.37**	**7.32**

Source: World Development Indicators (http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators).

Table 13
Mobilizing financial resources for development and capacity-building

	Gross domestic savings (percentage of GDP)			*Gross national savings (percentage of GDP)*		
	2000	*2009-2010*	*2001-2010*	*2000*	*2009-2010*	*2001-2010*
Africa						
Angola	41.85	28.78	30.51	23.75	15.84	16.93
Benin	5.99	12.18	7.15	10.37	12.79	9.61
Burkina Faso	0.64	—	2.92	5.12	—	7.00
Burundi	-6.03	—	-13.37	4.36	—	6.05
Central African Republic	5.17	2.72	1.58	—	—	—
Chad	5.48	12.00	14.43	—	—	—
Comoros	-5.71	-21.10	-11.65	—	—	—
Democratic Republic of the Congo	4.46	17.06	6.22	—	—	—
Djibouti	-6.53	—	7.43	5.35	—	24.71
Equatorial Guinea	74.54	58.81	78.63	—	—	—
Eritrea	-42.86	—	-26.13	4.37	—	—
Ethiopia	8.34	0.41	4.95	15.90	16.60	17.62
Gambia	8.54	6.50	8.55	—	12.59	14.62
Guinea	15.44	15.65	15.08	15.36	9.82	7.86
Guinea-Bissau	-8.50	—	-15.55	—	—	-7.31
Lesotho	-25.01	-30.89	-26.63	37.28	33.63	29.42
Liberia	—	—	-38.36	—	—	78.17
Madagascar	7.72	8.96	9.34	8.81	—	12.38
Malawi	3.83	14.72	6.52	9.52	12.83	8.70
Mali	11.96	—	12.27	15.94	—	12.66
Mauritania	-8.64	12.65	3.03	—	—	—
Mozambique	10.45	5.72	5.57	10.44	10.85	7.88
Niger	3.54	—	6.41	5.25	—	9.30
Rwanda	1.34	4.19	2.51	12.90	14.97	13.43
Sao Tome and Principe	—	—	—	—	—	—
Senegal	11.17	9.39	8.72	13.79	19.40	16.62
Sierra Leone	-14.32	3.32	0.12	-3.65	13.04	7.66
Somalia	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sudan	15.94	24.19	19.21	9.26	17.78	14.61
Togo	-2.17	—	2.58	0.75	—	5.88
Uganda	8.04	13.48	10.06	14.36	18.77	18.22

	Gross domestic savings (percentage of GDP)			*Gross national savings (percentage of GDP)*		
	2000	*2009/2010*	*2001-2010*	*2000*	*2009/2010*	*2001-2010*
United Republic of Tanzania	10.05	16.85	14.41	12.72	20.23	17.66
Zambia	3.05	31.48	20.85	-1.35	22.46	15.03
Average, Africa	**11.87**	**16.38**	**14.92**	**12.45**	**17.17**	**15.28**
Asia and the Pacific						
Afghanistan	—	-21.79	-19.97	—	—	—
Bangladesh	17.78	17.80	17.64	26.59	38.40	33.16
Bhutan	26.92	33.98	34.89	—	—	—
Cambodia	5.61	11.93	11.77	13.95	12.53	15.24
Kiribati	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	-0.19	21.50	13.07	2.44	19.59	12.01
Myanmar	12.35	22.69	14.40	—	—	—
Nepal	15.17	7.39	9.85	21.73	37.16	29.05
Samoa	—	—	—	—	—	—
Solomon Islands	-7.91	—	-4.51	-6.29	—	2.00
Timor-Leste	-46.87	—	—	—	—	—
Tuvalu	—	—	—	—	—	—
Vanuatu	11.12	—	12.41	9.30	—	12.40
Yemen	25.18	—	20.38	33.57	—	24.74
Average, Asia and the Pacific	**15.69**	**—**	**16.18**	**23.91**	**—**	**30.15**
Haiti	6.62	-20.20	-2.24	—	23.20	25.63
Average, all least developed countries	**11.60**	**15.95**	**15.35**	**16.96**	**25.19**	**21.91**

Source: World Development Indicators (http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators).

Table 14

Aid from Development Assistance Committee countries to least developed countries (net donor disbursements, in millions of United States dollars)

	1999-2000			2009			2010		
	Amount	*Percentage of total*	*Percentage of GNI*	*Amount*	*Percentage of total*	*Percentage of GNI*	*Amount*	*Percentage of total*	*Percentage of GNI*
Australia	276	28	0.07	728	26	0.08	1 160	30	0.10
Austria	108	23	0.05	348	30	0.09	459	38	0.12
Belgium	241	31	0.10	957	37	0.20	1 448	48	0.31
Canada	378	22	0.06	1 482	37	0.11	2 294	44	0.15
Denmark	583	34	0.35	1 098	39	0.34	1 127	39	0.36
Finland	120	31	0.10	451	35	0.19	479	36	0.20
France	1 360	28	0.10	3 273	26	0.12	3 681	29	0.14
Germany	1 399	27	0.07	3 390	28	0.10	3 655	28	0.11
Greece	29	14	0.02	117	19	0.04	106	21	0.04
Ireland	117	49	0.15	512	51	0.28	498	56	0.29
Italy	548	34	0.05	1 139	35	0.05	1 187	40	0.06
Japan	2 182	17	0.05	3 218	34	0.06	4 510	41	0.08
Korea	84	32	0.02	251	31	0.03	450	38	0.04
Luxembourg	35	29	0.20	153	37	0.39	155	38	0.40
Netherlands	766	24	0.20	1 627	25	0.21	1 858	29	0.24
New Zealand	34	28	0.07	104	34	0.09	101	30	0.08
Norway	459	35	0.29	1 258	31	0.33	1 405	31	0.34
Portugal	168	62	0.16	211	41	0.10	286	44	0.13
Spain	222	17	0.04	1 704	26	0.12	1 619	27	0.12
Sweden	501	29	0.22	1 398	31	0.34	1 408	31	0.30
Switzerland	278	30	0.10	699	30	0.14	619	27	0.11

	1999-2000			2009			2010		
	Amount	*Percentage of total*	*Percentage of GNI*	*Amount*	*Percentage of total*	*Percentage of GNI*	*Amount*	*Percentage of total*	*Percentage of GNI*
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1 241	31	0.09	3 922	35	0.18	4 680	36	0.21
United States of America	1 891	20	0.02	9 404	33	0.07	10 788	36	0.07
Total Development Assistance Committee	**13 021**	**24**	**0.05**	**37 443**	**31**	**0.10**	**43 973**	**34**	**0.11**
of which:									
Development Assistance Committee-European Union countries	7 439	29	0.09	20 300	30	0.13	22 646	33	0.15

Source: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (http://www.oecd.org/document/9/0,3746,en_2649_34447_1893129_1_1_1_1,00.html).

Table 15
External debt and debt forgiveness

	External debt stock (percentage of GNI)		*External debt stock, percentage point difference*	*Debt forgiveness or reduction, annual average (percentage of GDP)*	*Debt forgiveness or reduction, cumulative since 2002 (percentage of GDP)*
	2001	*2010*	*2001-2010*	*2001-2010*	*2001-2010*
Africa					
Angola	114.36	24.58	-89.78	-0.51	-4.56
Benin	62.02	18.41	-43.61	-4.17	-37.54
Burkina Faso	53.19	23.31	-29.88	-3.54	-31.82
Burundi	165.59	33.80	-131.79	-10.77	-96.97
Central African Republic	85.83	19.15	-66.68	-3.69	-33.19
Chad	64.37	25.74	-38.63	-0.38	-3.41
Comoros	108.29	90.08	-18.20	-0.03	-0.27
Democratic Republic of the Congo	269.15	47.08	-222.06	-12.29	-110.57
Djibouti	44.30	—	—	-0.06	-0.53
Equatorial Guinea	—	—	—	—	—
Eritrea	57.75	48.15	-9.60	-0.03	-0.27
Ethiopia	70.69	24.13	-46.56	-8.09	-72.78
Gambia	123.61	63.29	-60.32	-5.65	-50.81
Guinea	104.64	69.09	-35.55	-1.03	-9.24
Guinea-Bissau	492.58	124.78	-367.80	-8.86	-79.71
Lesotho	69.12	28.44	-40.68	-0.22	-2.01
Liberia	743.00	28.34	-714.66	-27.66	-248.94
Madagascar	92.91	26.60	-66.31	-10.60	-95.41
Malawi	153.52	18.51	-135.02	-11.86	-106.72
Mali	116.01	26.11	-89.90	-7.77	-69.93
Mauritania	209.78	67.02	-142.76	-12.01	-108.11
Mozambique	128.28	43.77	-84.51	-5.04	-45.39
Niger	83.88	20.51	-63.37	-6.39	-57.48
Rwanda	77.53	14.23	-63.30	-7.57	-68.09
Sao Tome and Principe	—	85.25	—	-27.09	-216.75
Senegal	76.47	28.50	-47.96	-4.66	-41.96
Sierra Leone	154.46	40.84	-113.62	-13.69	-123.19
Somalia	—	—	—	—	—
Sudan	123.46	39.05	-84.41	-0.06	-0.58
Togo	108.37	61.15	-47.22	-1.07	-9.67
Uganda	64.95	17.90	-47.04	-5.67	-51.06

	External debt stock (percentage of GNI)		*External debt stock, percentage point difference*	*Debt forgiveness or reduction, annual average (percentage of GDP)*	*Debt forgiveness or reduction, cumulative since 2002 (percentage of GDP)*
	2001	*2010*	*2001-2010*	*2001-2010*	*2001-2010*
United Republic of Tanzania	62.79	37.65	-25.14	-5.60	-50.38
Zambia	175.81	25.80	-150.01	-13.07	-117.66
Average, Africa	**109.36**	**31.67**	**-77.69**	**-5.01**	**-45.10**
Asia and the Pacific					
Afghanistan	—	—	—	-0.51	-2.55
Bangladesh	30.57	22.81	-7.76	-0.20	-1.80
Bhutan	58.24	63.27	5.03	0.00	0.00
Cambodia	70.17	43.38	-26.79	-0.23	-2.03
Kiribati	—	—	—	—	—
Lao People's Democratic Republic	146.67	78.96	-67.71	-5.69	-51.17
Myanmar	—	—	—	—	—
Nepal	48.82	23.40	-25.43	0.00	0.00
Samoa	54.77	56.64	1.87	-0.36	-3.24
Solomon Islands	40.50	38.85	-1.65	-0.23	-2.08
Timor-Leste	—	—	—	—	—
Tuvalu	—	—	—	—	—
Vanuatu	27.22	20.92	-6.29	-0.14	-1.22
Yemen	59.35	25.59	-33.76	-0.28	-2.50
Average, Asia and the Pacific	**38.55**	**27.05**	**-11.50**	**-0.35**	**-3.13**
Haiti	—	7.31	—	-3.75	-33.77
Average, all least developed countries	**80.21**	**29.54**	**-50.67**	**-3.08**	**-27.68**

Source: World Development Indicators (http://data.worldbank.org/data-catalog/world-development-indicators).

Table 16
Good governance

	Status of adoption of the United Nations Convention against Corruption		
	Signature	*Ratification*	*Acceptance*
Africa			
Angola	10 December 2003	29 August 2006	
Benin	10 December 2003	14 October 2004	
Burkina Faso	10 December 2003	10 October 2006	
Burundi			10 March 2006
Central African Republic	11 February 2004	6 October 2006	
Chad			
Comoros	10 December 2003		
Democratic Republic of the Congo			23 September 2010
Djibouti	17 June 2004	20 April 2005	
Equatorial Guinea			
Eritrea			
Ethiopia	10 December 2003	26 November 2007	
Gambia			
Guinea	15 July 2005		
Guinea-Bissau			10 September 2007
Lesotho	16 September 2005	16 September 2005	
Liberia			16 September 2005
Madagascar	10 December 2003	22 September 2004	
Malawi	21 September 2004	4 December 2007	
Mali	9 December 2003	18 April 2008	
Mauritania			25 October 2006
Mozambique	25 May 2004	9 April 2008	
Niger			
Rwanda	30 November 2004	4 October 2006	
Sao Tome and Principe	8 December 2005	12 April 2006	
Senegal	9 December 2003	16 November 2005	

	Status of adoption of the United Nations Convention against Corruption		
	Signature	*Ratification*	*Acceptance*
Sierra Leone	9 December 2003	30 September 2004	
Somalia			
Sudan	14 January 2005		
Togo	10 December 2003	6 July 2005	
Uganda	9 December 2003	9 September 2004	
United Republic of Tanzania	9 December 2003	25 May 2005	
Zambia	11 December 2003	7 December 2007	
Asia and the Pacific			
Afghanistan	20 February 2004	25 August 2008	
Bangladesh			27 February 2007
Bhutan	15 September 2005		
Cambodia			5 September 2007
Kiribati			
Lao People's Democratic Republic	10 December 2003	25 September 2009	
Myanmar	2 December 2005		
Nepal	10 December 2003	31 March 2011	
Samoa			
Solomon Islands			6 January 2012
Timor-Leste	10 December 2003	27 March 2009	
Tuvalu			
Vanuatu			12 July 2011
Yemen	11 December 2003	7 November 2005	
Haiti	10 December 2003	14 September 2009	

Source: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) (http://www.unodc.org/).

Table 17
Current voting shares (percentage) at International Monetary Fund and World Bank institutions

	International Monetary Fund	*International Bank for Reconstruction and Development*	*International Finance Corporation*	*Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency*	*International Development Association*
Africa					
Angola	0.14	0.17	0.07	0.20	0.31
Benin	0.05	0.07	0.02	0.16	0.26
Burkina Faso	0.05	0.07	0.04	0.14	0.26
Burundi	0.06	0.06	0.01	0.14	0.24
Central African Republic	0.05	0.07	0.02	0.14	0.23
Chad	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.14	0.23
Comoros	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.20
Democratic Republic of the Congo	0.24	0.17	0.10	0.38	0.37
Djibouti	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.13	0.21
Equatorial Guinea	0.05	0.06	0.01	0.13	0.03
Eritrea	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.13	0.20
Ethiopia	0.08	0.07	0.02	0.17	0.23
Gambia	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.13	0.24
Guinea	0.07	0.09	0.02	0.15	0.16
Guinea-Bissau	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.13	0.20
Lesotho	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.15	0.21
Liberia	0.08	0.04	0.01	0.15	0.24
Madagascar	0.08	0.10	0.03	0.19	0.25
Malawi	0.06	0.08	0.09	0.15	0.24
Mali	0.07	0.08	0.03	0.18	0.25
Mauritania	0.05	0.07	0.02	0.16	0.23
Mozambique	0.07	0.07	0.02	0.19	0.27
Niger	0.06	0.07	0.02	0.00	0.23
Rwanda	0.06	0.08	0.02	0.17	0.24
Sao Tome and Principe	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.00	0.23
Senegal	0.09	0.14	0.11	0.23	0.29
Sierra Leone	0.07	0.06	0.02	0.17	0.27
Somalia	0.05	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.05
Sudan	0.10	0.07	0.01	0.20	0.25
Togo	0.06	0.08	0.04	0.15	0.27
Uganda	0.10	0.05	0.04	0.22	0.22

	International Monetary Fund	*International Bank for Reconstruction and Development*	*International Finance Corporation*	*Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency*	*International Development Association*
United Republic of Tanzania	0.11	0.09	0.05	0.22	0.33
Zambia	0.22	0.18	0.06	0.26	0.35
Total, Africa	**2.47**	**2.53**	**1.09**	**5.07**	**7.79**
Asia and the Pacific					
Afghanistan	0.09	0.03	0.01	0.16	0.25
Bangladesh	0.24	0.30	0.38	0.38	0.57
Bhutan	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.20
Cambodia	0.06	0.03	0.02	0.18	0.29
Kiribati	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.00	0.20
Lao People's Democratic Republic	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.14	0.23
Myanmar	0.13	0.16	0.04	0.00	0.35
Nepal	0.06	0.07	0.04	0.17	0.26
Samoa	0.03	0.05	0.01	0.13	0.20
Solomon Islands	0.03	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.20
Timor-Leste	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.13	0.21
Tuvalu	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.01
Vanuatu	0.04	0.05	0.01	0.13	0.24
Yemen	0.13	0.15	0.04	0.18	0.32
Total, Asia and the Pacific	**0.98**	**1.08**	**0.67**	**1.60**	**3.53**
Haiti	0.06	0.08	0.04	0.14	0.24
Total, least developed countries	**3.48**	**3.69**	**1.80**	**6.80**	**11.56**

Source: IMF (http://www.imf.org/external/np/sec/memdir/members.aspx#2) and World Bank (http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/ORGANIZATION/BODEXT/0,,contentMDK:21429866~menuPK:64020035~pagePK:64020054~piPK:64020408~theSitePK:278036,00.html).

Annex II

Resource allocations of international and regional organizations for least developed country-specific activities, 2010/2011

Table 1
Total amount, in millions of United States dollars, and percentage of resources of various international organizations allocated to least developed countries in 2010/2011

Organizations	*Total resources*	*Share of budget*
Common Fund for Commodities	15.35[a]	34
Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia	0.175	—
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	710.3[b]	—
International Atomic Energy Agency	19.66[c]	—
International Fund for Agricultural Development	1 759[d]	52
International Trade Centre UNCTAD/WTO	482.9	55
International Telecommunication Union	7[e]	—
Inter-Parliamentary Union	0.15	1.25
Global Compact	0.2	—
United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)	177.47	41
United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN-Women)	60.8[f]	—
United Nations Capital Development Fund	—	97.7/99.4[g]
United Nations Conference on Trade and Development	—	36[h]
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	126.55[i]	12
United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change	1.7	—
United Nations Population Fund	280.80	49
United Nations Children's Fund	3 212.27[j]	51
United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime	4.8[k]	—
World Food Programme	2 600[l]	70
World Meteorological Organization	—	9/20[m]

Source: Based on submissions to the present report.
(Footnotes on following page)

(Footnotes to Table 1)

[a] This represents the 5 regular projects and 12 smaller projects approved in 2010/2011.
[b] Of this amount, 52 per cent was for technical cooperation projects/programmes and the rest for emergency operations and assistance.
[c] The breakdown is $18.04 million in technical cooperation funds and $1.62 million in extrabudgetary funds.
[d] This includes $920 million approved by the Board of the International Fund for Agricultural Development for least developed countries and $678 million in co-financing.
[e] This amount is in Swiss francs. The breakdown is 2 million francs in the regular budget and 5 million francs in project funds.
[f] This includes the 2011 budget for Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mozambique, the Niger, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, the Sudan, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania and 2010 and 2011 budgets for Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Kiribati, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nepal, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.
[g] Country/regional programmes only.
[h] This corresponds to the average share of total share national projects and programmes in support of least developed countries.
[i] The total is split between $20.98 million in regular programme resources and $105.58 million in extrabudgetary resources.
[j] Includes core and non-core programme resources.
[k] For good governance at all levels.
[l] This is the total resources received in 2010. These figures include multilateral resources (i.e. non-directed by the donor), where the World Food Programme (WFP) has full flexibility to allocate funding.
[m] This means that 9 per cent of the regular budget and 20 per cent of extrabudgetary resources are allocated to least developed country-specific activities.

Table 2
Total amount, in millions of United States dollars, and percentage of the budget of the Asian Development Bank allocated to least developed countries in 2010/2011

	Ordinary capital resources[a]		*Asian Development Fund*[b]		*Technical assistance*	
	Amount	*Percentage*	*Amount*	*Percentage*	*Amount*	*Percentage*
2010	800	7.6	1 442.49	45.4	25.05	17
2011	548.2	4.8	1 182.99	46.4	23.24	16.4

Source: Excerpt from the submission by the Asian Development Bank to the present report.
Note: Percentages are the Asian Development Bank's total assistance for the year.
[a] Ordinary capital resources include sovereign and non-sovereign assistance (loans, equities and guarantees).
[b] Asian Development Fund includes loans and grants.

Annex III

Major meetings organized by United Nations departments and agencies in favour of least developed countries, June 2011-April 2012

Title	*Date and venue*	*Organizers*	*Description*
Ministerial round-table breakfast on the gender dimension of education in post-conflict African countries and least developed countries	6 July 2011, Palais des Nations, Geneva	OHRLLS, OSAA, UNESCO	The event focused on issues of access to and quality of education as well as institutional and financial constraints that hamper the ability of post-conflict African countries and least developed countries to improve access to and quality of education. Recommendations were made on ways to improve gender equity in education and to ensure that education contributes to peace, security and development.
High-level policy dialogue on the challenges of education in Africa and least developed countries	7 July 2011, Palais des Nations, Geneva	OHRLLS, OSAA	The event featured four presentations followed by interactive discussions. It reviewed the education trends in Africa and least developed countries, underlined emerging education needs in these countries and offered recommendations on how to address them.
Second Committee special event on Follow-up to the Fourth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries: integrating its provisions into national plans and policies	21 October 2011, UNHQ, New York	Bureau of the Second Committee, DESA, OHRLLS	The side event contributed to raising awareness of the importance of streamlining the Istanbul Programme of Action into national policies and of taking concrete steps to use the Programme of Action in planning processes. It discussed how this can be achieved based on experiences from the implementation of the Brussels Programme of Action and the mainstreaming of the Millennium Development Goals into poverty reduction strategy papers and donor strategies. The importance of political will and the broad involvement of all ministries and stakeholders was highlighted.

Title	*Date and venue*	*Organizers*	*Description*
Workshop on coordination and partnership for enhancing the benefits of weather-, climate- and water-related services in the development of least developed countries in Africa	9-10 November 2011, Cotonou, Benin	WMO, OHRLLS	The workshop provided an overview of the Istanbul Programme of Action with a focus on agriculture and food security, disaster reduction and access to information and technology. It also presented the road map for the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action to the national focal points. The conclusions highlighted the continued need for capacity-building and increasing human and financial resources and the empowerment of women to upgrade national meteorological services. They also stressed that more cooperation with other stakeholders should be envisaged, including the use of synergies with other national actors in development, especially the national focal points.
Least Developed Countries Ministerial Conference on the structural transformation of least developed countries and UNIDO's support in the context of the Istanbul Programme of Action	24-25 November 2011, Vienna	UNIDO, OHRLLS	At this meeting, an overview of the Istanbul Programme of Action and a road map were presented. This offered an opportunity for discussion on the central measures needed by the various actors within the United Nations system and beyond for their effective and timely implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action with respect to productive capacity. The meeting adopted the 2011 least developed country ministerial plan of action, which highlights the role of a well-functioning and socially responsible private sector. It further states that small and medium-sized enterprises and an appropriate legal framework are crucial for promoting entrepreneurship, investment, agribusiness development and economic diversification and for achieving full and productive employment and decent work for all.

Title	*Date and venue*	*Organizers*	*Description*
Side event on aid and development effectiveness in the least developed countries for the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action	30 November 2011, Busan, Republic of Korea	Government of Nepal, OHRLLS, LDC Watch	The meeting was held on the margins of the Fourth High-level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, held in Busan, Republic of Korea, from 29 November to 1 December 2011. The side event emphasized that integration of the Istanbul Programme of Action into least developed country development strategies and donor policies is an important step towards the alignment of aid with national priorities. There was also a consensus that improved ownership and leadership are required for improved aid and development effectiveness and for the effective implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action in least developed countries. Other essential ingredients of success include broader participation and contribution to all stakeholders, stronger involvement of all, a bold reflection of gender dimensions in policymaking process, deserved attention to the peace and security agenda and strong monitoring and evaluation frameworks underpinned by verifiable indicators.
Asia-Pacific regional meeting on the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action	14-16 December 2011, Bangkok	ESCAP, OHRLLS	The meeting brought together all key stakeholders of the Istanbul Programme of Action, including member Governments, the United Nations system, relevant regional organizations, development partners and wider civil society from Asia and the Pacific region. The meeting adopted a regional road map for implementing the Istanbul Programme of Action in Asia and the Pacific region for the decade 2011-2020. It contains a set of capacity development activities aimed at delivering knowledge products, dissemination and advocacy, expert services, and reviews, monitoring and evaluation, and provides a basis for formulating technical assistance programmes and projects at the regional, subregional and national levels.

Title	*Date and venue*	*Organizers*	*Description*
Joint meeting of the Executive Boards of UNDP/UNFPA/UNOPS, UNICEF, UN-Women and WFP. Discussion on United Nations collaborative contribution to the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action	30 January 2012, UNHQ, New York	UNDP, UNFPA, UNOPS, UNICEF, UN-Women, WFP	The collaborative contribution to the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action was discussed. In this context, the alignment of support with least developed country priorities, including productive capacity and employment, the reduction of transaction costs and the need to involve country offices in the support for mainstreaming the Istanbul Programme of Action into national development plans was emphasized. The agencies involved are planning to focus on four tasks that need to be accomplished if least developed countries are to achieve their overall goals, namely: build national capacities for effective delivery of basic services, mainstream the Istanbul Programme of Action into national plans and programmes, help youth to develop and strengthen resilience, including to climate change.
Breakfast meeting: Building productive capacity for achieving the Millennium Development Goals: leveraging the role of the Economic and Social Council for the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action	9 March 2012, Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations, New York	President of the Economic and Social Council, OHRLLS	Participants discussed ways to promote dialogue on key policies and support measures required to foster productive capacity and inclusive and sustainable economic growth in least developed countries. They concluded that least developed country-specific needs should be incorporated into the post-Rio and post-2015 development agenda; wider development partners should be included in the Economic and Social Council to ensure coherent and integrated approaches to least developed countries, with special focus on strengthening policy coherence with the Bretton Woods institutions and WTO; and least developed country priorities should be mainstreamed in all Economic and Social Council forums.

Title	*Date and venue*	*Organizers*	*Description*
Academic round table: Economic growth and structural change: Priorities for the least developed countries	9 March 2012, Columbia University, New York City	World Bank (Development Research Group), OHRLLS, Columbia University	It was highlighted that the Istanbul Programme of Action calls for a shift in the development paradigm, with a rebalancing of priorities between the productive and social sectors as well as a balanced role of the State and the market. Justin Lin, Chief Economist of the World Bank, recommended that by following their comparative advantage, least developed countries can attract some of the jobs that will no longer be competitive in China owing to increasing wages, in line with his theory of new structural economics. Other panellists emphasized the role of the state in promoting change, mobilizing resources and expanding trade opportunities.
High-level event on the implementation of the Istanbul Programme of Action for the least developed countries	24 April 2012, Doha	UNCTAD, OHRLLS	The event was organized as part of the UNCTAD XIII conference. It examined the challenges associated with graduation from least developed country status and the actions that both the least developed countries and their development partners need to take to ensure a smooth transition within the agreed timetable. It was concluded that the business-as-usual approach to policymaking is not sufficient to place the least developed countries on the path of more dynamic and inclusive development and to enable half of them to meet the graduation criteria by 2020.